SUMMARY

OF THE

2001 CHEMICAL STOCKPILE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

July 24 - 26, 2001

Portland, Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2001 Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program (CSEPP) National Conference was held at the Portland Marriott Downtown Hotel in Portland, Oregon, July 25-26, 2000. The conference was attended by approximately 450 CSEP Program participants representing the U.S. Army, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), other federal agencies, state and local governments, contractors, and other organizations involved in the program.

Plenary sessions were held at the beginning and the end of the conference, featuring state and federal officials from top executive levels of the program. The rest of the conference was devoted to breakout sessions on specific program-related topics. Breakout sessions were held on the following topics:

- Automation
- Budget & Cooperative Agreements
- Close-out / End of CSEPP
- Exercise and Training
- Medical
- Planning Integration
- Performance Measures
- Public Outreach

Each breakout session featured either individual speakers or panel discussions followed by questions and answers. Most breakout sessions were presented more than once to give participants flexibility in their choice of topics. In addition to these breakout sessions, there were meetings for County Commissioners and Citizens Advisory Commission members to discuss program issues of mutual interest. These meetings are not recorded in this report.

On July 24, immediately prior to the conference, one-day sessions were held on four topics of special importance to the program:

- Exercise and Training
- Medical
- Planning Integration
- Public Outreach

Each of these topics is the subject of an ongoing working group or Integrated Process Team (IPT). The results of the four pre-conference sessions were reported to the conference at large during the morning plenary session of the first conference day. Also on July 24 there was a one-day meeting of the State Directors. That meeting is not recorded in this report.

This report summarizes the proceedings of the topical pre-conference sessions and the conference including both the plenary and breakout sessions. It was compiled from notes taken by Argonne staff, which were later edited and summarized. There were no formal transcripts or recordings made of the sessions. The note-takers made every effort to capture the essence of each presentation and subsequent questions, answers, and comments. However, it is possible that there are errors of omission or commission with respect to what was said and who said it.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANCA	Anniston Chemical Activity
ACTFAST	agent characteristics, toxicity, first aid and special treatment
AEGL	acute exposure guideline level
AMC	Army Materiel Command
AMSAA	U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity
ANL	Argonne National Laboratory
AYE	Alternate Year Exercise
BGCA	Bluegrass Chemical Activity
CA	Cooperative Agreement
CAC	Citizens Advisory Commission
CAIRA	Chemical Accident/Incident Response and Assistance
CAR	Capabilities Assessment for Readiness
chem demil	chemical demilitarization
CSDP	Chemical Stockpile Demilitarization Program
CSEP	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness
CSEPP	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program
DA	Department of the Army
DCD	Deseret Chemical Depot
decon	decontamination
demil	demilitarization
DVD	digital video disk
EAS	Emergency Alert System (formerly known as Emergency Broadcast System)
ECA	Edgewood Chemical Activity
EMA	emergency management agency
EMF	emergency management function
EMIS	Emergency Management Information System
EMPG	emergency management performance grant
EMS	emergency medical service
EMT	emergency medical technician
EOC	emergency operations center
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESOH	Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health
ETO	Exercise and Training Officer
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FEMIS	Federal Emergency Management Information System
FME	federally managed exercise
FRP	Federal Response Plan
FTCA	Federal Tort Claims Act
FTP	file transfer protocol
FY	fiscal year
GB	nerve agent
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS Cont'd

HD	Blister Agent (Mustard)
HMO	health maintenance organization
HQ	headquarters
HTML	hyper text markup language
HVAC	heating, ventilation and cooling
ICAM	improved chemical agent monitor
ICS	incident command system
IDLH	immediately dangerous to life and health
IEM	Innovative Emergency Management, Inc.
IPE	integrated performance evaluation
IPT	Integrated Process (Product) Team
IRF	Immediate Response Force
IRZ	immediate response zone
JCAHO	Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations
JIC	joint information center
JIS	joint information system
LCCE	life cycle cost estimate
LTC	Lieutenant Colonel
MCA	Military Claims Act
MCE	maximum credible event
MOA	memorandum of agreement
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MQIT	medical quality improvement team
NECD	Newport Chemical Depot
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NEMA	National Emergency Management Association
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NRT	U.S. National Response Team
OASA-ESOH	Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Env't, Safety & Occup'l Health)
OASA-ALT	Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics & Tech'y)
ORISE	Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
OSC	On-Scene Coordinator
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PAD	protective action decision
PAI	protective action implementation
PAO	public affairs officer
PAR	protective action recommendation
PAZ	protective action zone
PBCA	Pine Bluff Chemical Activity
PCD	Pueblo Chemical Depot

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS Cont'd

PEG	performance evaluation guide
pdf	portable document format
PIO	public information officer
P.L.	Public Law
PMCD	Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization
PNNL	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
PPE	personal protective equipment
REP	radiological emergency preparedness
RTAP	Real-Time Analysis Platform
SAIC	Science Applications International Corporation
SBCCOM	Soldier and Biological Chemical Command
SIP	shelter-in-place
SRF	Service Response Force
START	simple triage and rapid treatment
TAR	tone alert radio
TOCDF	Tooele Chemical Demilitarization Facility
TSIP	terminate shelter-in-place
UMCD	Umatilla Chemical Depot
VX	nerve agent
WMD	weapons of mass destruction

1 PRE-CONFERENCE MEETINGS

1.1 Exercise and Training

Presentation #1: Integrated Performance Evaluation Methodology (Ron Barker, FEMA HQ and John Gray, SBCCOM)

The Integrated Performance Evaluation (IPE) method looks at groups of related activities to carry out response, called "response streams." For example Response Stream 4 is Protective Action Implementation (PAI); it includes the whole flow of activities relating to physical implementation of a protective action decision, such as establishing traffic and access control, securing transportation support, opening screening and decontamination centers, opening shelters and so on.

The method identifies the inputs and conditions necessary for the stream to be carried out. For example, for PAI, a protective action decision (PAD) is a necessary input. Others inputs and conditions might include resources, personnel, weather, and planning inputs such as evacuation routes. The method also identifies where the various components will take place: on post or off pots, in the field, at an emergency operations center (EOC), at a mass care shelter, et cetera.

Using the IPE, the evaluator is asked to simply record the actions that take place during the exercise along with their times, rather than filling out a questionnaire. After the exercise the evaluators construct a timeline of events. As a basis for evaluation the evaluators use the Performance Evaluation Guide (PEG) which breaks down each stream into tasks, gives a description of the expected outcome of each task, and outlines the steps involved in completing the task. It also indicates where each task will take place, and gives references relating to it.

A crosswalk relates the IPE PEG streams and tasks to the old objectives and evaluation elements. For example the PAI stream includes parts of the old objectives 4, 5, 6 and 8.

Presentation #2: CSEPP Exercise Schedule (Ron Barker, FEMA HQ and John Gray, SBCCOM)

The current schedule for FY 2002 is:

BGCA	(F)AYE	24 October 2001
PBCA	FME	13 February 2002
ANCA	FME	6 March
PCD	AYE	20 March
NECD	FME	3 April
ECA	(F)AYE	17 April
UMCD	(F)AYE	8 May
DCD	FME	11 September

The FY 2002 schedule has a concentration of exercises in the spring months that will be detrimental to the program and the people involved. Traveling to a new exercise every two weeks will be a strain on personnel and will disrupt their other (non-exercise) duties. Also the schedule will make it more difficult to train for and implement the new IPE system. Ways are being sought to alter the schedule for the better.

For subsequent years, options are being explored to improve the exercise scheduling process and produce a more even schedule. One way is to set allowable date slots and then allow the sites to select which one they want; however that was rejected as too restrictive on the sites and jurisdictions involved. Each jurisdiction has its own constraints, including the need for scheduling around other required exercises such as those for the radiological emergency preparedness (REP) program.

It would be desirable to meet the following criteria when scheduling exercises: no exercises during the week of or week prior to a holiday; a minimum of three weeks between exercises; no exercises in the first or last two weeks of the fiscal year; no exercises during July or August. Within these limits, in the general the more even the spacing the better.

Presentation #3: CSEPP Training Activities in FY01 and FY02 (Robert Norville, FEMA HQ)

Mr. Norville first described the training course schedule. There are a number of blackout dates due to the exercise schedule and other factors. He then talked about new courses and products, the CSEPP training web, CSEPP curriculum, and training gaps.

New courses and products include Version 2 of Agent Characteristics, Toxicity, First Aid and Special Treatment (ACTFAST) course; the emergency planners companion CD-ROM on worker operations and evacuee support; Re-ACTFAST 2 video- and DVD-based refresher training; and the revised training crosswalk.

The CSEPP Training Web was initiated in March 1999 and is hosted at http://emc.ornl.gov. It is one of the major mechanisms for distributing CSEPP training documents and related CSEPP information. Its success is measured by the number of downloads of training courses and other materials, which is summarized in the following table.

Document Type	Downloads Last Quarter	Total Downloads
Tech Reports	2,963	17,717
Training Course	3,531	16,950
Job Aids	804	4,259
Program Documents	2,445	9,927
Total	9,743	48,853

Mr. Norville went through the most popular download items for the last quarter and total to date.

Current training works in progress include a revised CSEPP JIC Advisor course, revised Exercise Evaluator course, revised PPE classroom course, emergency planners companion on communications, and a shelter-in-place training video. There is a new proposal for a medical training course for paramedics and hospital staff covering protocols for treatment of chemical agent exposure injuries.

1.2 Medical

The pre-conference medical meeting was hosted by Ms. Lisa Hammond, FEMA Region VI, and LTC (Dr.) David Mukai, Command Surgeon, SBCCOM. Approximately 50 people from the medical and emergency management communities attended the session. There were five formal presentations given that will be discussed individually below. The major thrust of the meeting was to expand and organize the membership of the Medical Quality Improvement Teams (MQIT), and for the teams to establish their goals, objectives and the operational framework for their future activities. Presentations on selected subjects were also included in the agenda.

Opening Remarks (Denzel Fisher, OASA-ESOH)

Mr. Fisher welcomed the attendees and stated that he believes that CSEPP is focused and has progressed well during the years. Further, he stated that he believes the medical area has made the most progress. He attributed much of the success to input from the entire medical community and the input of many people and singled out Dr. Roger McIntosh, Ms. Linda Anderson, and Ms. Debbie Kim for their contributions. Mr. Fisher discussed the similarities of CSEPP and the Weapons of Mass Destruction programs. He concluded by thanking the group for coming and encouraged them to participate in the discussion and emphasized that resolution of issues will be based upon their active involvement.

Co-Hosts Lisa Hammond, FEMA VI, and LTC (Dr.) David Mukai, SBCCOM also provided brief welcoming comments.

Presentation #1: CSEPP Medical Update (Lisa Hammond, FEMA Region VI)

Ms. Hammond presented a review of the medical accomplishments that occurred at the 2000 National Conference, progress that has occurred since that conference, FY 01 medical training and exercise support levels, and the programming and budgeting procedures required to obtain programmatic financial and technical support. She reviewed the "best practices" adopted at last year's conference and the progress that has been made toward resolving open issues. She then explained that in response to a survey, six functional MQITs were established to resolve specific medical issues.

The results of a second survey were used, in part, to structure the medical portion of the 2001 CSEPP National Conference. She encouraged use of the medical page on the CSEPP Planners Web Site as a method of improving communications and encouraging integration of the planning and medical functions of CSEPP. She then reported on the status of FY 2001 medical training and exercise support. Ms. Hammond concluded her remarks by again stating the need to follow established procedures in requesting support for medical training and exercises two years in advance to ensure their consideration for inclusion in the Presidential budget process.

Discussion:

Comment: Dr. Roger McIntosh clarified a comment on one of the training activity slides by indicating that more CSEPP people are now attending the Toxic Chemical Training Course conducted in Maryland than in past years when attendance had been predominately military personnel.

Presentation #2: Performance Measures (Dr. Richard Alcorta, Director, Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems)

Dr. Alcorta stated that a hospital should be capable of responding to a mass casualty incident and that their planning, training and exercises activities must prepare the system to manage a large number of live victims. The problem is how to evaluate their level of medical preparedness. He believes performance measures can be developed and should be included as part of a total improvement effort. Dr. Alcorta reviewed the "FOCUS PDCA" (Plan, Do, Check, Act) improvement process that was presented at last year's conference. In addition, he discussed the four medical parts of Utah's assessment tool (first response, transportation, medical facilities, and augmenting teams) as another way to measure performance. He then mentioned the need to consider the mandates of the Government Performance and Results Act, the CDC evaluation criteria, and the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations standards in developing performance measures.

Dr. Alcorta then discussed the value of the CSEPP exercise reports in measuring performance and providing information to the hospital CEO that show strengths and weaknesses in specific areas. Using the Utah assessment tool he cited examples of areas where shortfalls might be expected to be found in any hospital. These areas could all be considered performance

measures.

He concluded his comments by stating that the assembled medical community needs to be actively involved in determining the performance measures and to look at areas that can be monitored on a routine basis. Dr. Alcorta suggested that medical organizations should use existing resources, federal, state and local mandates, and program and medical guidelines as a starting point in developing performance measures.

Presentation #3: Medical Quality Improvement Teams (Sharon Wilcoxson, SAIC)

Ms. Wilcoxson served as facilitator for the session devoted to the MQITs. She explained that the six MQITs evolved from analysis of the results of last year's survey regarding the possible need to establish a Medical IPT. The initial volunteer membership came from a subsequent query of the medical and emergency management communities. Ms. Wilcoxson stated that the objective of the day's activities is to break into the individual MQITs, review their membership and develop ideas as to where they want to go and what is needed to make the teams function. Ms. Wilcoxson then explained the FEMA vision on how the teams should work and explained that the "action plan" can be used in organizing the team, identifying what to do and how it can be done. She concluded by reviewing the descriptions of the tasks identified by the survey for each MQIT and encouraging attendees who had not volunteered for a team to join one.

Q&A

Q: Lloyd Baker, Utah Dept. of Health – What mechanism is in place to let team information be known and to advise of any decisions that have been made?
A: The web site should be used. Jim Cody suggested that the Standardization Team should be the lead team, and that the Chairperson of each of the MQITs should be part of an overarching medical committee. He recommended that we use the web site to obtain positions on issues and that views go to the Standardization Team for possible decisions or recommendations. Further, he stated that the work can be done by telephone with an occasional meeting. In addition, he would like to have a representative from each of the sites on the Exercise and Training Team. Sharon Wilcoxson indicated that representatives from each site could be added on an ad-hoc basis as needed.

Comment: (audience): Two concerns were expressed: 1) that the teams could get to be too large to be effective, and 2) that ultimately there needs to be an authority person to make decisions.

Q: Robert Geller: How do you reconcile groups coming up with different decisions from each group?
A: There needs to be liaison person from each of the teams on an overarching team.

Q: Will Roberts and Wilcoxson act as liaisons?
A: They will support the needs of the group, provide administrative support, prepare minutes, and function as liaison.

Q: Lloyd Baker: Are the "best practices" and other recommendations mandated or optional?

A: Sharon Wilcoxson: They are not mandated but identified as "best practices." Dr. Mukai supported the concept that the recommendations would not be mandated. Jim Cody indicated that the exercise IPT has the power to mandate and that there could be a problem in recommending best practices vs. forcing a recommendation on the group. Dr. Mukai indicated that if a recommendation needs to apply to all parties then mandating the recommendation or position could be considered.

Q: (audience): What about funding?
A: Joe Herring understands the possible need for funding

Sharon Wilcoxson introduced the team leaders: Communications - Dr. Richard Alcorta, Maryland; Hazard Assessment - Lisa Hammond, FEMA Region VI; Performance Measures - Debbie Kim, Utah; Protection and Equipment - Michael Parette, Arkansas; Standardization - Michael Proctor, Alabama; and Exercise and Training - Jim Cody, Colorado. The individual team members were also introduced. She then asked the remaining attendees to introduce themselves and requested that those not assigned to a team consider joining one. Dr. Mukai added that some of the teams might be combined if, after meeting, a team decides there is insufficient work. Debbie Kim stated she wants to be sure that the information from this meeting is shared with those who are not in attendance. It was stated that a report of the meeting will be available on the web site. The teams then broke into separate work sessions and later reported the results of their individual sessions to the entire audience as follows.

Protection and Equipment Team: Chairperson Michael Parette of Arkansas stated that the seven individuals who participated discussed the current status of the various states regarding equipment and basic medical protection procedures. Other broad areas discussed included requirements of OSHA, monitoring procedures and equipment, protection factors, and who to add to the team. Items that the team believed needed review included: protection of the workers and the public, patient tracking systems, worker safety (medical evaluations-pre/post incident), public protection (evacuation, sheltering and extractions-escape hoods), decontamination of the public and workers, and protective equipment. The team discussed various communications options and concluded that at this time the use of conference calls and a few meetings would be appropriate.

Performance Measures Team: Chairperson Debbie Kim of Utah reported on the teams' initial discussions. Their vision is to develop and measure "safe practices" that can contribute to the successful treatment of a chemically contaminated person in both the pre-hospital and hospital environments. They identified some specific areas: planning, decontamination, equipment, antidotes, and treatment procedures and protocols that could be measured in terms of either their existence in document form, people's knowledge levels, how to use equipment, and the amount of time needed to accomplish a particular task. However, these measures should become part of an overall medical capability improvement process and not an end unto themselves.

Communications Team: Chairperson Dr. Richard Alcorta, Maryland, identified the agreed mission statement as "To rapidly disseminate and inform members, populace and the medical community of important CSEPP related information in a timely and interactive means so that issues can be identified, aired, and remedies formulated." The team listed a series of benefits to a

web site that include: instant access, central repository of information, and more timely processing of information and opinions. A major portion of the discussion addressed management issues associated with the web site. These included things such as who has control of the site, who authorizes entry into the medical site, who allows material to be placed on the site, what is the maximum scope of the material area, who has the responsibility for keeping the site current, recording team reports, addressing legal issues, and security to permit open exchange of information. They concluded by discussing the need to develop an online system of patient tracking and the operational and legal concerns of establishing such a system.

Training and Exercise Team: Chairperson Jim Cody, Colorado, outlined the issues that were identified. These include: (1) considering the implications of federal training standards, (2) establishing a baseline criterion based on performance objectives, (3) determining the proper method of conducting initial training either using instructor lead sessions or videos, (4) determining the composition and frequency of actual training, refresher training, and drills, (5) conducting joint agency training vs. segmented or segregated training, (6) improving EMS and hospital response activities, (7) establishing incentives for physicians as an inducement to attend training, (8) examining the possibility for federal funding to reimburse jurisdictions for drills and exercise as a way to encourage participation, (9) improving ways to share "best practices," and (10) identifying ways to motivate administrative personnel to become more involved in all activities.

Hazard Assessment Team: Chairperson Lisa Hammond, FEMA, reviewed the teams comments. The team changed the name of their group from "Threat Assessment" to "Hazard Assessment" to more accurately reflect the thrust of their responsibilities. Three questions were asked that could affect emergency planning. First, do the Maximum Credible Events (MCEs) need to be updated. Second, how does the new puff model affect the MCEs. And third, do the new Airborne Emergency Guideline Levels (AEGLs) change casualty projections. Mike Myirski, SBCCOM, briefed the team on the current status of the modeling and provided the following answers. The probability of accidents has not changed much and the types of planning accidents, including agent amounts will remain the same. The puff model will provide more credible, yet still conservative information to the planners and response personnel than the D2PC model. Using the new AEGLs and other toxicity models, the chemical hazard distances and casualty levels can potentially decrease with mustard. However, projections could increase for GB and will increase significantly for VX. It was recommended that the Army provide the casualty data for each site to the MQIT for discussion by and sharing with the respective communities. It was also suggested that the sites should consider having a planner join the MQIT.

Standardization Team: Chairperson Michael Proctor of Arkansas reviewed the challenges identified by the team. These include determining if the communities are meeting the "best practices" adopted at the 2000 conference that relate to decontamination and youth antidotes protocols. The team discussed the following subjects: the need to define terminology (i.e. exposure vs. contamination); how to integrate the JCAHO, SARA Title III, and OSHA standards into the medical community; how to develop an integrated response system that incorporates an incident command system; the need to identify roles and responsibilities, and the need to train the staffs. After discussion on how recommendations and conclusions generated from all the teams

would be processed for adoption or forwarding for a national level programmatic decision, it was decided that the Standardization Team would serve as the focal point for all teams.

Presentation #4: CSEPP Planners Website (Dr. Richard Alcorta, Maryland)

Dr. Richard Alcorta, Chairman of the Communications MQIT, presented a briefing that showed the capability of the CSEPP-Planners web site. The site was developed early in 2001 to serve as a resource to the CSEPP community by gaining rapid access to a wide variety on information of interest to CSEPP planners. It has links to other important sites of interest, access to CSEPP Policy Papers, Planning Guidance documents, minutes of important meetings and conferences, and the capability to exchange information through a message board system and chat capability. There are currently 142 people registered to use the site. Dr. Alcorta then conducted a real-time demonstration of available information and features of the web site. It was stated that web site access would be available to attendees during the conference so that the individuals could register for future access to the web site and use its capabilities. Further, he encouraged the participants to take a proactive role with respect to the site and communicate ideas and comments.

Discussion:

Comment: There is a lot of important information available in medical journals and it could be shared by use of abstracts.

Comment: We may need to be concerned about liability issues associated with information available through the site. There is also the question of how much information to post.

Comment: There are programs and information available that we should link to so that we do not duplicate information.

The audience agreed that the site is a useful tool. It was decided that ANL should continue to ensure that information approved by the Communications Team is posted on the site.

Presentation #5: Sustainment Training (Dr. Roger McIntosh, SAIC)

Dr. McIntosh explained the computer-based sustainment training capability being developed by SAIC for medical personnel in hospitals and field responders. It will contain six interactive, self-paced modules (Nerve Agents, Vesicants, Triage, Decontamination, PPE and Worker Fitness, and Case Studies). Titled “Train4life,” it will be available in CD form and through the web site. He explained that each module would include a self-evaluation quiz to provide immediate feedback and a final 10-question test. All of the modules are being evaluated for continuing education credit and should be available by about November 2001. The modules will permit information to be compiled on who took the training and what were the test results. Dr. McIntosh demonstrated two of the six modules and concluded his comments by stating that this training appears to be suited for refresher rather than initial training. He believes that qualified instructors should conduct initial training.

Q&A

Q: What is the purpose of the exam and explain the process?
A: The examination is to get people to pay attention to the material and test their knowledge. Each module permits the individual to go back and forth between training segments of the module, take the test and receive a test score.

Q: Lloyd Baker: What level of knowledge is the training geared to?
A: Dr. McIntosh: The basic level of knowledge.

Q: How will you access the site?
A: Dr. McIntosh: It can be accessed from the medical page on the web site and it will be password protected.

Q: Michael Proctor: What about a tougher test?
A: Dr. McIntosh: It can be done but we need to build in additional information.

Presentation # 6: CDC's Role in Chemical Demilitarization (Sascha Beck, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC))

Ms. Beck reviewed the CDC mandates contained in the original Congressional tasking dating back to 1969 and as supplemented in 1986 and 1996 to oversee the Department of Defense lethal chemical warfare agent management and destruction activities. She listed specific oversight responsibilities and activities that relate to the eight Chemical Stockpile Disposal Program (CSDP) sites, and the Non-Stockpile Program that effects 38 states. Ms. Beck outlined their tasks related to medical readiness and evaluation of the eight CSDP sites. She added that coming to their oversight decisions is complex because of the implications of public acceptance, science and sound judgement. She concluded her remarks by citing some examples of articles from the press that address the subject of public trust and CDC's role as the trusted agent or honest broker. The day's activities were completed at the conclusion of this presentation.

1.3 Planning Integration

Presentation #1: Introduction and Overview (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ and Dennis Legel, SBCCOM)

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. by session leaders Joe Herring and Dennis Legel. They reviewed the day's agenda and discussed a brief history of the planning efforts since the last National Conference in Little Rock.

At the 2000 National Conference, planners identified 33 key unresolved planning issues for the program to focus on. They are:

1. Off-post notification.
2. When does the clock start for notification if a "heads up" phone call is placed?

3. Better define non-surety events and establish criteria for notification.
4. Responding to and planning for a false activation of Alert & Notification systems.
5. Activation and training issues for Tone Alert Radios (TARs).
6. Share forms (notification, etc.), MOAs, plans, ideas.
7. Notification forms.
8. Sharing Utah's operational information with other sites since they are actively destroying agent.
9. Conduct and post planning research on a CSEPP website so that it can be shared among all sites.
10. Help teach one another about planning.
11. Call in to the FEMA Conference Bridge monthly to share information.
12. Need for reciprocal information exchange between off-post and on-post communities.
13. How should an all-clear be sounded for people sheltered in-place?
14. There is a need for an off-post monitoring plan.
15. Use of ICAMs in monitoring off-post.
16. How is mass medical screening really going to work in an evacuation?
17. Decontamination planning.
18. Identification procedures for special needs populations.
19. Public Education (Arizona survey and the actions resulting from it).
20. How is the depot going to get people needed to respond to an event and its aftermath back into the installation?
21. Form single-issue working groups.
22. Form site-specific planning groups.
23. Lack of coordination and integration of plans
24. Integration of CSEPP with non-stockpile material program plans.
25. Which is in charge, the Federal Response Plan (FRP) or the National Contingency Plan (NCP)?
26. Need to follow the cycle of continuous improvement.
27. Integrating PAR and PAD decision-making.
28. Evacuation vs. sheltering.
29. Lack of feedback to state and depot after PAD is made by counties
30. Reentry and recovery.
31. Extraction (What is required to declare an area clear?).
32. Training issues for new employees, deputy directors, planners, etc.
33. Planners have no authority to conduct drills.

These planning issues became the basis for the agenda for the December 2000 Planning Conference held in Dallas. Sixty-nine planners and program managers from FEMA, Army, and state & local governments attended the Dallas conference. In Dallas, planners added an additional 8 issues and then prioritized these issues using a voting process. The top-10 issues led to the formation of four Workgroups: Shelter-in-Place, Planning Coordination/Integration and Performance Measures, Planning Website, and Reentry/Recovery.

The Shelter-in-Place (SIP) Work Group is chaired by Marianne Rutishauser, Tooele County Emergency Management and was formed to address the following planning issues:

- Evacuation versus sheltering.
- How an all-clear should be sounded for people sheltered in-place.
- Policy for egress from shelter-in-place.
- Handling of people after they leave shelter-in-place (decontamination, transportation, etc.).

The Plan Coordination/Integration and Performance Measures Work Group is chaired by Doug Becvar of FEMA Region VIII and Joe Herring of FEMA HQ. Originally there were separate Coordination/Integration and Performance Measures workgroups, then they combined. The combined workgroup addressed the following issues:

- Lack of coordination and integration of plans
- Better define non-surety events and establish criteria for notification
- Define what constitutes a "completed" plan for key planning areas.
- Define how to determine that a plan has been "coordinated" for a key planning area.

The Planning Website Work Group is chaired by Joe Herring and was formed to:

- Share forms (notification, etc.), MOAs, plans, ideas.
- Conduct and post planning research on a CSEPP website so that it can be shared among all sites.

The Re-Entry/Recovery Work Group is chaired by Steve Douglas of Pueblo County, Colorado and was formed to address the following issues:

- Re-entry and restoration
- Monitoring vs. modeling to identify restricted areas
- Extraction — What is required to declare an area clear?

Joe Herring discussed what happens next. The Work Group products will be presented to the Planning Community today for comment & endorsement. Then the refined Work Group products will be presented to the overall CSEPP Community over the next two days during the Planning and Performance Measures breakout sessions. The CSEPP Planning Community will then determine the content and format for the planned December 2001 Planning Conference. The Work Groups will continue to work assigned issues as refined by the CSEPP community this week.

FEMA and SBCCOM are planning for a CSEPP Planning Conference at Perdido Beach, Alabama in December 2001. Joe Herring and Dennis Legel distributed a Planning Conference Survey and requested that attendees please complete and fill them out before lunch. IEM will tabulate the results during lunch and they will be reported back this afternoon during the conference planning session.

Mr. Herring also identified other issues that are likely to affect CSEPP planning, including the next GAO Report on CSEPP due out in August. GAO is concerned about the lack of coordination between the CSEPP National Benchmarks, CSEPP Exercise Evaluations and CSEPP Planning Guidance. A rewrite of planning & exercise documents is being considered by FEMA. The GAO is also concerned about sharing best practices and lessons learned. Planners have come a long way in this regard, and we should discuss how best to continue to improve.

Presentation #2: Shelter in Place Workgroup and Report from Subcommittee on Evacuation vs. Sheltering in Place (Marianne Rutishauser, Tooele County, UT and John Sorensen, ORNL)

Next on the agenda was a report from the Shelter-in-Place Workgroup and Subcommittees by Marianne Rutishauser, SIP Committee Chair. Ms. Rutishauser introduced the SIP Subcommittee Chairpersons, herself for Subcommittee #1, George Yantosik for Subcommittee #2 and Tom Warnock for Subcommittee #3.

The SIP Workgroup was formed at the December 2000 Planning Conference in Dallas. Their task is to answer three questions: (1) How to develop an approach to PAR/PAD decision making on evacuation vs. shelter-in-place; (2) When and how to recommend egress from shelter-in-place; and (3) How to handle or process people terminating a shelter-in-place protective action.

In February 2001, the SIP Workgroup held their initial meeting in Edgewood, Maryland. They stepped through current practices in the protective action decision-making and alert and notification processes, identified areas where guidance could be misinterpreted, lacked detail, or was simply unavailable, looked at available tools for decision-making, and quickly identified the need to work closely with the Public Affairs community to develop a national strategy for SIP. Their second meeting was held in Denver in June 2001 to refine their products. The SIP Committee and various subcommittees also held numerous conference calls. Minutes of these meetings and conference calls are posted on the Planners' Website. Marianne then introduced the results of the work from SIP Subcommittee #1, tasked with the issue of Evacuate or Shelter-In-Place, the Protective Action Decision Process.

In accordance with Policy Paper #1, the most important objective of CSEPP is avoiding fatalities to the maximum extent practicable, should an accidental release of chemical agent occur. This priority should be reflected in all protective action recommendations and decisions.

Information exchange is a critical component of an effective emergency response operation, and a program requirement. This exchange should be a cooperative, coordinated, and proactive process, and should be detailed in a Letter or Memorandum of Agreement that covers:

- The Chemical Emergency Notification Levels (CENLs)
- The format and timing for exchange of information
- The provision for all notifications required, feedback, and updates
- The exercise of all daily activities that will mimic and reinforce emergency response activities

Protective action decisions must be rapid to be effective. A delay in decision-making is a trade-off between time and potential fatalities in areas closest to the storage site. If a "heads-up" notification is utilized in your community, it neither starts nor stops the initial on-post to off-post notification clock. Likewise, it does NOT start the 8-minute public notification window for the off-post officials. A heads-up notification is important. It allows the off-post community to come to an enhanced state of readiness.

There is no simple technical method for protective action decision-making. A decision tree may be helpful, particularly during planning. Checklists are useful for identifying conditions favoring SIP or evacuation, but may not lead to an optimal decision. Detailed analysis generally requires the use of models.

John Sorensen, a Subcommittee #1 member, discussed some factors related to the selection of SIP vs. Evacuation. John identified some clear-cut cases, including:

- When no fatalities are expected.
- When action can be implemented before plume arrives.
- When evacuation "show stoppers" exist.
- When the release is expected to last a long time.

John also identified conditions requiring more detailed analysis:

- Neither option prevents fatalities.
- When conditions constrain evacuation.
- When release duration is between 30 minutes and 120 minutes.
- When the public is not inclined to shelter.
- When special populations are involved.

John then presented a sample decision tree that illustrated the many factors that influence this decision and just how complex this process can become.

Ms. Rutishauser resumed, pointing out that modeling is an approved and accepted tool for predicting and tracking the potential movement of the plume and making protective action decisions. The CSEPP Off-Post Monitoring Integrated Process Team (IPT) Report (CSEPP 1999) identifies dispersion modeling as the primary means to both define the hazard wedge and the plume, and to determine when to terminate SIP. Hazard analysts and planners must have a working knowledge of the capabilities and limitations of models used for decision-making.

Some critical decision-making criteria include:

- Population density.
- Population location.
- Estimated time to evacuate vs. SIP.
- Estimated time to warn the public.

- Tip and tail times.
- Met data.
- Accident characteristics.
- Air infiltration rates.
- Incident Containment.
- Seasonal data
- Tools for decision making

Evacuation is the preferred protective action if it can be completed before the arrival of the plume. Other factors that favor evacuation are:

- Long duration releases.
- Daytime releases with good road conditions.
- Mobile population, unconstrained evacuation.

Precautionary evacuation should be implemented for planned or controlled events with potential human health consequences, e.g., accident site mitigation, as well as for situations that may result in a chemical stockpile emergency such as an uncontrolled wildfire in the vicinity of the chemical storage area.

Factors favoring Shelter-in-Place are:

- Lack of time to evacuate.
- Short-duration releases.
- High population density.
- Night-time releases.
- Mobility-impaired people, constrained evacuation.

An interactive public education program is key to the public's acceptance of a SIP emergency response strategy. Some information points of particular interest include:

- Duct tape and plastic sheeting are appropriate materials for expedient shelter. They provide a good means of reducing infiltration if used properly, and will not break down when challenged with a chemical agent vapor.

- Wet towels or washcloths provide no infiltration reduction for a chemical agent vapor and are not recommended for expedient respiratory or room protection.

- The average modern home today has about 0.5 air changes per hour (acph); older Southern homes 4.0 or 5.0 acph; and the average U.S. home has approximately 0.7 acph.

- Taping and sealing a room (expedient SIP) inside an average home reduces the acph to 0.3 in newer homes, but the reduction is not as dramatic in older homes with higher air exchange rates.

A study done by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in 1991 indicated that a moderately-priced closed vehicle had a stationary acph of approximately 0.5, and a rate of 2.5 acph with the motor running and the HVAC system set to recirculate. Thus even relatively leaky houses offer a higher protection factor against vapors than an automobile.

Not all of the populations will or can comply with a Protective Action Decision. Therefore, all planning for protective action decision-making and response activities must consider:

- Evacuees responding to instructions or evacuating spontaneously.
- People sheltering-in-place.
- Ending SIP at the appropriate times.

It is Subcommittee #1's recommendation that future exercises should be designed to accommodate a requirement to demonstrate the entire decision-making process and its implementation, from initial notification through the notification to end SIP.

Presentation #3: Report of Subcommittee #2 on Terminating Shelter in Place (George Yantosik, ANL and Dan Maloney, D&E Technical)

SIP Work Group Sub-Committee #2 was asked to determine when and how a sheltered population should end SIP to reduce the overall exposure of this population, and especially to minimize fatalities. This work was done in parallel with a FEMA request of Argonne National Laboratory to find a concept and methodology to decide the best time and way to end SIP.

Conditions that influence when to terminate SIP include:

- Source term values based on eyewitness information and accident site monitoring.
- Meteorology (stability class and wind speed).
- Shelter air change rates.
- Shelter distance from the source.
- Dose-response relationship.

Circumstances that contribute to exposures associated with SIP include:

- Exposure before taking shelter.
- Exposure during SIP due to vapor infiltration.
- Exposure following SIP while ventilating shelters, simply remaining outside shelters, or relocating.

Options to end SIP include:

- Resume normal activities with no restrictions.
- Ventilate the shelter but remain indoors.
- Exit from the shelter and remain nearby.

- Relocate to a designated facility.

Mr. Yantosik then presented a concept to decide when and how to end SIP. Planners should examine the relationships among variables that determine how much exposure a sheltered population will receive, to find the combination that gives the smallest area of a chosen toxic effect. The best time and way to terminate SIP is that which produces the smallest area where that level of effect is expected. The preferred methodology to decide when and how to end SIP is to use a computer routine to examine the relationships among the variables. A computer model can display the best time and action to terminate SIP in a user friendly format.

At this point Dan Maloney presented a case study scenario in which an accident occurs involving a pallet of fifteen GB-filled M55 rockets on the igloo apron. The initial report is only that an explosion occurred in the pallet of rockets. Details on the condition of the munitions are not immediately available. The initial hazard assessment, and the first PARs and PADs are based on the MCE for this operation – two rocket warheads explode and thirteen rockets leak. Later an update from the field says that two rocket warheads exploded but only twelve leaked. The accident site is decontaminated at about forty-five minutes after the accident, except for 60 sq. ft area on equipment that is decontaminated 105 minutes after the accident. Accident site monitoring shows very high readings initially, decreasing slowly over forty minutes, and dropping precipitously five minutes later.

ANL developed a computer model called TSIP (Terminate Shelter In Place) to prove the validity of the proposed concept and methodology to decide when and how to terminate SIP. Dan then demonstrated a series of screen captures and the actual TSIP model to illustrate how it can be used to reduce the area exceeding a threshold dose by timely termination of SIP.

George Yantosik then resumed his briefing, identifying elements of a public education program to support a shelter termination strategy. They include:

- The hazard is primarily a vapor.
- Vapor infiltration can reduce the protection of your shelter over time.
- SIP is a two-step process - quickly take shelter, then end shelter when instructed. Timing is important.
- SIP must include a plan to exit.
- Know your options for ending SIP.
- Emergency instructions to support a shelter termination strategy should be:
    - Consistent with public education materials.
    - Clear and Concise with regard to ending SIP.
    - Repeated frequently.
    - Broadcast to areas where both evacuation and SIP was recommended.

Agreements are required to support a SIP termination strategy. The Army should begin to calculate SIP termination times ASAP after making its initial PAR, and give off-post officials a "heads-up" on possible SIP termination times and options. All officials should share their PADs

ASAP with officials in other jurisdictions, and give the Army information about the status of SIP in all sub-zones. The Army should provide PARs to end SIP for each affected sub-zone ASAP.

Planning to support a shelter termination strategy should follow this sequence:

- Discuss the concept and methodology.
- Describe the public education effort.
- Include protocols for sharing SIP termination information with other jurisdictions.
- Include procedures to broadcast instructions to end SIP.
- Discuss support for the sheltered population when SIP ends.
- Army plans should describe how to expedite collection of information to decide when and how to end SIP.

Subcommittee #2 has recommended a number of exercise enhancements to support a shelter termination strategy. They include:

- Collecting and assessing eye-witness and monitoring information to expedite SIP termination decisions.
- Deciding when and how to terminate SIP.
- Translating SIP termination decisions to public instructions.
- Broadcasting emergency instructions.
- Providing information to supplement emergency instructions.
- Assessing and responding to feedback from the public and the news media.

Presentation #3: Report of Subcommittee #3 on Handling of Persons Exiting from Shelter (Tom Warnock, FEMA HQ)

A report prepared by this subcommittee will be placed on the CSEPP Planners website. According to guidance, every person who has been in an area where there might have been a vapor hazard should be relocated, medically screened, and decontaminated. Priority may need to be given to certain SIP populations over evacuees who may have arrived at the screening points earlier but have not yet been processed. Priorities for decontamination of such SIP populations impacted by the plume are recommended as follows:

- Priority #1--symptomatic individuals.
- Priority #2--people who were in the proximity of the plume (based on location and time).
- Priority #3--everyone else.

If mustard agent is involved, the potential delayed effects of mustard agents should be considered. Crowd control issues may also need to be considered when prioritizing. Communities should consider having separate screening and decontamination sites for SIP populations in order to avoid queuing behind evacuees.

Persons who shelter in-place will be exposed to some level of agent if their shelters are under the plume and are not positively pressurized with filtration. There is thus a potential for

significant delay in screening and care. Persons exiting sheltered areas may also pass through areas still under the plume. As a result, different routes and additional screening and decontamination sites may be advisable if resources permit.

Companion animals (pets) need to be considered; current FEMA guidance is for people to take companion animals with them. Many people are likely to take their companion animals with them when evacuating; therefore, the needs of animals must be considered in screening, decontamination, victim care, and evacuee support. Options for emergency managers include agreements with veterinary colleges or commercial animal-related businesses. Note that Red Cross shelters accept service animals only.

Several existing documents may be of use to emergency planners. Some CSEPP communities have already developed plans, either CSEPP specific or for all hazards. Potentially useful documents were listed on a slide and will be added to the Planners Website.

If people have impairments and cannot relocate, they should exit the shelter or ventilate the shelter if exit is not possible. Some people may be prevented from exiting their shelters due to agent symptoms, disabilities, and/or lack of transportation. There remains the need for ventilation and/or exiting of shelters when appropriate. Ventilation or ventilation combined with exiting without relocation may be the only options available to some – preferable to remaining in a closed-up shelter. Planners should consider this when designing EAS messages and public information materials.

No arbitrary dose threshold for driving impairment was set. This issue should be worked jointly with the CSEPP medical IPT. It has been referred to the medical IPT for further review.

All protective action populations should be tracked to better ensure access control to sheltered zones during re-entry, tracking of potential long-term health effects, re-unification, and the management of claims for compensation. Tracking of SIP populations may be needed due to potential problems with accessing confidential medical records and records maintained by the American Red Cross and other voluntary organizations. Planners should consider establishing a toll-free number for reunification inquiries. Callers could be given a pre-established identification number so that information can be more easily retrieved.

Relocation of special facility populations after SIP is the preferred action. If immediate relocation is not feasible, these populations should exit their facility if possible, ventilate their facility if exit is not possible, and wait for relocation resources or monitoring of the facility. Some special facilities may not be able to relocate; however, ventilation at the appropriate time should not be delayed (except in facilities already protected by a pressurization system). Models such as D2-Puff may be useful when determining priorities for the termination of SIP in special facilities. When all other factors are equal, planning should be focused on special facilities with controlled populations (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, and prisons). This issue has been referred to the re-entry working group for further review.

Presentation #4: Planning Performance Measures Workgroup (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ, Douglas Becvar, FEMA Region VIII, Allen Kniphfer, Jefferson County, AL, and Bob Stephens, FEMA HQ)

The main idea behind Planning Performance Measures is to help communities have complete and coordinated plans. Secondly, this ties into Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reporting on the National Quantitative Performance Measure CP-1. The Performance Measures working group has developed a framework and measurement tool. Trial implementation will be in this quarter; full implementation will start in Q1 of FY02. We are at the forefront of performance measurement for CSEPP. FEMA HQ policy guidance for the group was to keep it simple, especially in the first year, and phase in more implementation in later years. Integrating efforts with the local Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) was a goal. The first emphasis was on giving sites a tool to help them improve; GPRA reporting is secondary.

Another Workgroup tasker was developing a definition of "non-surety" for off-post notification of non-surety events. All sites were surveyed on this topic and information is being compiled into a white paper.

The Workgroup conducted a regional structured interview to get a snapshot or baseline on CSEPP plan status. The results were assembled and summarized without "naming names."

Another effort undertaken by this Workgroup involved analyzing differences and similarities of the Synchronization Matrix and the System Analysis processes. The results will be posted on the Planners Website "resources" link.

Doug Becvar then presented a briefing on performance measurement for CSEPP emergency plans. The CP-1 performance indicator resulted from the Government Performance Results Act of 1993, a Congressional mandate requiring "agencies to be more openly accountable." GPRA requires quantitative measurement of performance and will have its full implementation in FY 2002. Stakeholder coordination is a must.

Forty potential CSEPP National Performance Indicators were identified in April 2000. Seven were identified as primary and thirty-three identified as secondary. Four critical national performance indicators were selected from the seven primary indicators. The Planning Performance Measures Workgroup was established at the 2001 Planning Conference in Dallas, Texas in December 2000. Their mission was to define what constitutes a "completed" and "coordinated" plan. The Workgroup developed a CP-1 Performance Measure implementation plan and crosswalked references, selecting 170 elements pertaining to the key planning areas of:

- Public Notification or Warning
- Evacuation Implementation
- Shelter-In-Place Implementation
- Public Education/Outreach
- Emergency Communications

A key concept of this process is that the measurement involved in this process is to determine complete and coordinated plans, not capability. The evaluation methodology contains 15 items or elements drawn from the CSEPP Exercise Blue Book, the CSEPP Planning Guidance, and the local CAR.

The CP-1 Completeness Checklist applies to CSEPP jurisdictions, including IRZ Counties, PAZ Counties, Host Counties, and CSEPP States. It does not apply to support agencies or organizations such as the American Red Cross.

The Workgroup requests that the 15 item CP-1 Completeness Checklist be completed by CSEPP jurisdictions by August 31, 2001 (to meet reporting at end of 2001). Official implementation will begin with the first quarter of FY02. The 170 essential plan elements will phase in over a four year period. This enables a jurisdiction to measure their Plan and develop an upgrade strategy before the four year period ends, and limits the potential for a major plan revision and distribution every year. The Workgroup has members from every CSEPP site and is willing to provide technical assistance to each site for their "beta" review. Each site should work as a group in the beta review. This eases the process and promotes integration and coordination.

CP-1 performance measurement reporting will be provided by the CSEPP Community Exercise Report for the quarter the exercise was conducted. CP-1 Performance Measurement Reporting will be accomplished quantitatively for the other three quarters of the federal fiscal year. Counties and states provide only raw data to FEMA Regions to reduce the reporting burden. The 2002 Cooperative Agreement Instructions discuss the reporting process. The Scoring/Rating Formula relates the CSEPP National Benchmarks and the Emergency Management Functions in the local CAR.

CP-1 reporting must also acknowledge the 12 CSEPP National Benchmarks used by the FEMA CSEPP Branch, Army & GAO. These are being cross-walked to the 13 Emergency Management Functions (EMF) used in the Local CAR patterned from NFPA 1600 and developed and endorsed by FEMA, IAEM and NEMA for use nationally.

Allen Kniphfer from Jefferson County, Alabama then briefed the participants on their experience using the CAR to build an Emergency Management Program and Organization. The CAR self assessment process answers the following questions: Does the organization and program meet the needs of the County and the mandated requirements? Are goals, objectives and mission being achieved? Can the organization deploy resources and help the community and its citizens?

EMA Staff completed an internal assessment and the results were used in a formal review. An outside contractor, Emergency Response Institute, conducted an external formal program review. This review scrutinized the emergency management organization and program and included a review of the physical layout and management of the emergency operations center. The review findings of the CAR Program Elements identified 176 end products. Of these, 9% of end products were in place and functioning, 53% of end products were existing but in need of improvement, and 37% of end products did not exist, but were needed. This effort enabled

Jefferson County to critically review and determine the program's growth. It also became the basis for the agency's strategic plan and indicated that additional personnel were required.

Recommendations from this review included:

- Develop a strategic plan for the agency.
- Develop a comprehensive hazard vulnerability analysis.
- Develop a comprehensive emergency management plan based on the HVA.
- Develop EMA response procedures.
- Develop an EOC operations manual to include EOC position checklists.
- Develop training program for the EOC staff.
- Develop mitigation plan.
- Develop disaster recovery programs.

The outcomes included a road map to where the program was headed, increased support for the program, additional staff, increased funding for the agency, and upgrading the agency's facilities and equipment.

Bob Stephens from FEMA HQ provided a briefing on the CSEPP Capability Assessment for Readiness (CSEPP CAR). The CAR is a process designed to collect, analyze, track and report quantitative local emergency management readiness data. Its purpose is to assist emergency managers to assess strengths, weaknesses, and to identify needed improvements. It was originally developed to assess results under the Government Performance and Results Act.

FEMA and NEMA jointly developed the State CAR. The Local CAR followed the State CAR and was jointly developed by FEMA, NEMA, and IAEM. A Tribal CAR will be implemented later this year. The CSEPP CAR will be implemented in late summer of this year. All 56 States, Territories, and Insular Areas have completed the State CAR in 1997 and 2000. It produced data useful for strategic planning, budgeting at State and Federal levels (including FEMA's Emergency Management Performance Grant process), and helps raise the level of professionalism with the State emergency management community. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard on Disaster and Business Continuity Programs (NFPA-1600), based on the CAR, is the basis for the Emergency Management Accreditation Program being developed by NEMA to accredit states in emergency management.

The CAR identifies 13 emergency management functions (EMFs) and 79 attributes, broad criteria by which the emergency management program's performance can be assessed. There are 170 characteristics, more detailed criteria that further clarify the area being assessed, for a total of 249 elements. The CSEPP CAR methodology will be conducted quarterly, with the initial assessment in late summer 2001. It uses a rating scale of 1 to 5 used to rate characteristics that score attributes and roll up values for each of the 13 EMFs.

Mr. Stephens then demonstrated the CSEPP Local CAR software and how a jurisdiction uses it to score its planning performance. He summarized the benefits of using the Local CAR to include:

- Creating a shared vision for emergency management.
- Justifying budget, staff and resources.
- Identifying emergency management areas for improvement.
- Improving communication between CSEPP communities and their local and State partners.
- Providing an initial emergency management baseline and helping refine those of the State partners.

Presentation #5: CSEPP Planners Website (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ and Gary Scronce, IEM)

Joe Herring presented the website Workgroup whose members include Dr. Richard Alcorta, Maryland; Don Broughton, Madison Co., KY; Deanna Davis, Benton Co., WA; David Gilder, FEMA Region III; John Gray, SBCCOM; Dee Dee Hill, Talladega Co., AL; Charles Williams, AEMA; Gary Scronce, IEM; and Paul Hewett and Paul Roberts, ANL.

The following priority issues were assigned this Workgroup at the Dallas Planning Conference:

- Share forms (notification, etc.), MOAs, plans, ideas.
- Conduct and post planning research on a CSEPP website so that it can be shared among all site.

The primary intent of this Workgroup was to provide a means for planners to post results of planning research they have done for access by rest of the CSEPP community. The Workgroup has conducted 5 conference calls to provide input, coordinate reviews, and prepare this report-out. The effort was funded in January 2001 and a prototype website was completed and released on 2/1/01 for review by the Workgroup. A beta version was competed and released on 4/12/01, including prototype medical pages. The Planners' pages are currently in a maintenance mode. The medical pages are awaiting input for the next stage of development. Current site statistics are:

- No. of registered users = 142.
- 18 new registrations in June.
- 14 new registrations in July (through 7/20).
- No. of Sessions Served = 489.
- No. of Pages viewed per session = 5.5.
- Average session time = 4.5 minutes.
- No. of user-supplied docs posted = 78 (since 5/1/01).

The URL is: www.csepp-planners.net. There are three major sections: An opening public page, the planners home page, and the medical home page. The public page includes the CSEPP

login for access to non-public pages, registration for CSEPP users, CSEPP site information, CSEPP resources, agencies and organizations, information sources, and newspapers online.

Members pages include communications resources, a message board organized by benchmarks, chat rooms, planning & medical mailing lists, newspapers online, and contacts information built from existing lists and registration information. Users can manage their own contact information, and can establish jurisdiction administrators. Gary Scronce then loaded the web page and provided a guided tour of its layout and content.

Mr. Herring noted that CSEPP will demonstrate this website during the Planning breakout sessions, and will have a computer set up with an Internet connection for conference participants to access the website during next three days.

Future development issues include promoting the posting of site-specific planning documents by the planning community, continuing to identify useful new content including the quarterly State Directors meeting presentations, FYO2 CA guidance, and exercise reports.

Presentation #6: Reentry and Recovery Working Group (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ, Steve Douglas, Pueblo County, CO, Clark Combs, Kentucky DEM, David Holm, Colorado OEM)

Mr. Herring introduced the Workgroup membership including Steve Douglas (Coordinator), Pueblo County DEM, John Short, Pine Bluff Army Depot ANL Support, Joe Herring, FEMA HQ, David Holm, Colorado Office of Emergency Management, Wayne Thomas, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Randy Hecht, FEMA Region IV, Ted Medley, Colorado Office of Emergency Management, Clark Combs, Kentucky Emergency Management Agency, Mike Myirski, SBCCOM PM-CSEPP, Kevin Kammerer, SBCCOM PM-CSEPP, Terry Hobbs, FEMA Headquarters, Ron Graham, USDA Headquarters, Mike Parette, Arkansas Department of Health, and Ted Ryba (Facilitator), IEM, Inc.

The Workgroup was tasked with the following Priority issues from the Dallas conference:

- Reentry and restoration.
- Monitoring vs. modeling to identify restricted areas.
- Extraction - what is required to declare an area clear?

It quickly formed several Subgroups, including:

- Definitions: Develop definitions for the terms Reentry, Recovery, and Restoration.

- "Who's in Charge?" Review existing regulations, statutes and laws to determine if this is defined for the recovery and restoration phase. If it is not defined, use existing systems already in-place as a model for recommendations to develop an appropriate system.

- "Is it Safe to go Home?" Map out a process to allow the decision of reentry to be made by local personnel. Includes defining terms and reviewing the use of modeling vs. monitoring.

- Agricultural Issues: Investigate a mechanism for dealing with the impact to agricultural resources following a chemical accident or incident. The CAI may be limited to on-installation, or may extend beyond the installation boundary. Scope includes dealing the perception there may be a contamination issue to dealing with an actual contamination issue.

- Legal Claims: Investigate the process for handling claims made following a chemical accident/incident that extends beyond the installation boundary. Includes determining which regulations, statutes or laws may apply.

The Reentry/Recovery Working Group Definitions sub-group included Wayne Thomas (lead) and Randy Hecht. Its objective was to develop definitions for the terms Recovery, Reentry and Restoration. For source material it relied upon the "Draft CSEPP Reentry/Restoration Plan Workbook" dated June 1994. It has proposed the following definition of Recovery:

> *The period when immediate threat to human life has passed and general evacuation has ceased. Recovery refers to the actions taken to restore an affected area as nearly as possible to its pre-emergency condition. Thus, it refers to the process of reducing exposure rates and concentrations in the environment to acceptable levels for unconditional occupancy or use after the emergency phase of an accident or incident. Recovery differs from reentry in that recovery encompasses the efforts and resources needed to return the affected are to its pre-accident condition. Recovery includes both short- and long-term activities. Short-term recovery returns vital systems to minimum operating standards, seeks to restore critical services to the community, and provides for the basic needs of the public. Long-term recovery focuses on restoring the community to its normal, or improved, state of affairs and on returning life to normal or improved levels. The recovery period is also an opportune time to institute mitigation measures, particularly those related to the recent emergency. (This definition was developed with the CSEPP community in mind. It does not consider or include the Department of Defense definition of recovery as it relates to the actions required to re-secure munitions involved in a chemical agent accident.)*

It proposed the following definition of Reentry:

> *The entry of persons into an affected (i.e., contaminated or potentially contaminated) area following a release. The terms controlled reentry, restricted reentry, occupational reentry, and emergency reentry refer to the temporary, short-term readmission of persons (primarily emergency workers) into a restricted zone for the purpose of performing some essential task. The terms uncontrolled reentry, unrestricted reentry, and general reentry are used in the context of uncontrolled, permanent re-access to refer to those provisions leading up to unlimited public access or the re-occupation or use of previously restricted zones after the hazards have been reduced to acceptable levels.*

It proposed the following definition of Restoration:

> *Removal and decontamination of all chemical warfare agents, removal of any rubble, and emergency repair of structures and facilities. The culmination of these activities is reestablishment of major utilities and services and the return of social and economic activities to near-normal levels. The terms recovery and restoration have been used in combination to refer to the entire group of activities undertaken to prepare a previously contaminated and restricted area for unlimited re-occupation and/or use by the public.*

Looking ahead, this subcommittee recommends that the 1994 Draft CSEPP Reentry/Restoration Plan Workbook be finalized.

The next presentation was about the Reentry/Recovery Working Group "Who's In Charge?" sub-group. This sub-group includes Randy Hecht (lead), Ted Medley, Steve Douglas, and Clark Combs. Clark Combs presented this part of the briefing. This group addressed the question: for a community level event (the plume leaves the installation), who is in charge? Their answer is that coordination & cooperation between federal, state & local governments is called for in each of the following:

- Federal Response Plan;
- National Contingency Plan;
- DA Pam 50-6; and
- CSEPP Planning Guidance.

Each jurisdiction has an "in charge" role, depending on geography, which can be managed through the application of the Incident Command System (ICS). The Incident Command System provides an organizational structure for response to oil spills and discharges and hazardous substance emergencies. ICS divides emergency response into five functions: Command, operations, planning, logistics, and finance/administration. Unified command is a critical component of an ICS. It creates an organizational link between the organizations responding to an incident.

Mr. Combs discussed the capabilities and constraints of all the various entities in the ICS / Unified Command group. Sources of additional ICS information include:

- NRT's Minimum Essential ICS Training Elements.
- NRT's Federal Natural Resource Trustees and the ICS/UC.
- Annex 3 of the NRT Integrated Contingency Plan Guidance
- U.S. Coast Guard's Oil Spill Field Operations Guide.
- U.S. Fire Administration's Computer-assisted Instruction for ICS: Self-study Course.
- USCG's OSC2 – On-scene Command and Control Prototype.
- Setting Objectives in a Unified Command: The "Cost" of Leadership,1999 International Oil Spill Conference Proceedings.
- Incident Command System, Fire Protection Publications, Oklahoma State University

The "Safe to go Home" Sub-group was led by Mike Myirski and Randy Hecht and included Kevin Kammerer and Wayne Thomas as members. This sub-group relied on source material from the CSEPP Off-Post Monitoring Integrated Process Team Report (December 1998). They concluded that monitoring technology cannot always determine chemical warfare agent plume travel, and monitoring should be used in concert with air dispersion modeling to assist in reentry/recovery decision-making.

The Agriculture sub-group presented next. This sub-group is led by Terry Hobbs and members include Ron Graham and John Short. Steve Douglas presented their briefing.

State & local government has the lead in developing reentry/recovery plans. USDA provides assessment of state plans, participates in exercise evaluations, participates as a player during exercises, and provides agriculture ingestion pathway training to states and local governments. In the post-emergency response phase, state and local government requests federal assistance, and develops protective action decisions from recommendations made by the state's staff, USDA, or other federal agencies.

When requested, USDA mobilizes to the affected area and provides technical assistance. In accordance with the USDA CSEPP plan, the 13 USDA agencies can develop food ingestion pathway protective action recommendations for the state and lead federal agency and can assist in developing sampling plan, food control area, and embargo/quarantine procedures. USDA also can provide assistance under the federal response plan including Emergency Support Function 4: (Firefighting) and Emergency Support Function 11 (Food).

The sub-group's objectives and goals were to review CSEPP Planning Guidance Appendix M and the Planners Web Site for references, policy guidance, and other documents. They are developing a Critical Planning Elements list and a Helpful Resources list.

Dave Holm presented the final R&R Workgroup briefing, from the Legal Claims sub-group. Membership includes Steve Douglas, David Holm, and Joe Herring. Dave identified several avenues for resolving legal claims following a CSEPP event, including the Local Commander's Authority, the Stafford Act, the Federal Torts Claims Act, the Military Torts Claims Act, federal environmental legislation, public officials' discretionary funds, and congressional/executive action. Dave briefly discussed the benefits and limitations of all of these options and likened them to a series of wrenches, sockets and pliers, all of which might fit but none of which fit exactly, the "nut" that is CSEPP Reentry and Recovery.

In general, this group has concluded that it is likely there would be legislative action and/or extraordinary executive action to compensate the victims of a CAIRA event. However, this is not mandated or delimited, and subject to political whims and concerns. A good analogy would be the Cerro Grande fire last year in New Mexico, where Congress passed extraordinary relief legislation in less than 6 months.

The R & R working group offered the following wrap-up comment. CSEPP communities should utilize recovery tabletop exercises to:

- Resolve the "who is in charge" questions.
- Apply the Incident Command System.
- Get a reality check on sampling and analysis resources/rates.
- Identify community specific claims issues.
- Identify public information requirements.

The final session of the day addressed planning for the 2001 CSEPP Planning Conference and was led by Dennis Legel, SBCCOM. Dennis reviewed what participants liked about the 2000 Planning Conference, as well as what evaluations indicated needed improvement. Dennis emphasized the need for more participation by State/County Planners, the realization that CSEPP had to firm up conference planning sooner (date, location, agenda, etc.), and notify potential attendees much sooner. To that end, he announced that the 2001 planning Conference will be held at the Perdido Beach Resort near Mobile, Alabama from December 4-6.

Very few responses were collected from the survey circulated at the beginning of this session, designed to discuss Planning Issue Prioritization. Therefore, Dennis asked IEM to put the survey on the Planners Website and run it for several weeks to get better feedback. The results of this morning's survey generated the following priority issues:

- Training issues for new employees.
- There is a need for an off-post monitoring plan.
- Need for reciprocal information exchange between off-post and on-post communities.
- 911 Centers overloaded when sirens sound.
- Currency and completeness of CSEPP Planning Guidance.
- Identification procedures for special needs populations.

Suggested case studies from this morning's survey included:

- Tunnel fire in Baltimore.
- Movement of WWI mustard munitions in France.
- Evacuation from Oregon wildfires.
- Response coordination at Columbine H.S.
- Eunice, LA train derailment.

At 3:30 p.m. the Planning and Integration preconference meeting was adjourned. The chairpersons of the 4 work groups then met with Joe Herring and Dennis Legel to prepare their briefing materials for the National Conference Opening Plenary session.

1.4 Public Outreach

Opening Remarks:

Steve Horwitz and John Yaquiant welcomed the group and briefly went over changes in the agenda. They then introduced Mr. Dan Civis, FEMA HQ Branch Chief for CSEPP.

Mr. Civis praised the public affairs program, reviewing how many public affairs initiatives started in Umatilla. Pooling the best business practices, as opposed to eight sites working independently, has been effective. The National IPT's work has helped move things forward. Mr. Civis said he hopes Alabama shares these lessons and begins to work together. Alabama's media campaign is the next funding priority. CSEPP is looking at a public affairs life-cycle cost estimate using Umatilla's media campaign as a base. The sites have done a lot of work to get this estimate together; now those estimates can be put into the life cycle cost estimate (LCCE). Mr. Civis said he doesn't know that there will be "a dime for public affairs efforts" and asked for patience. He said every effort will be made to fund the planning that has been done. Everyone needs to work together with program managers to fund projects and move them ahead. He reiterated that the public affairs teams around the country are doing a terrific job.

Don Jacks, FEMA HQ, gave a brief talk and served as session moderator for the day. Mr. Jacks discussed how the recent Baltimore train wreck had affected his life personally and how he realized he wasn't completely prepared to shelter in place or to evacuate. He was better prepared than many people because of his job. Getting people ready, so that they know what to do when they hear the sirens, is our objective. Each site will share some lessons learned.

Presentation #1: Best Practices/Volunteers, Bill Bischof, Jefferson County PIO (Arkansas) and Matt Johnson, Volunteer

Jefferson County, Arkansas, has used volunteers from St. Joseph's Catholic School in their preparedness effort. Kids are great because they're willing to try something new. Matt Johnson has volunteered for two years now and works mostly in the JIC. He writes news releases and handles telephone calls. He is a senior in high school. Mr. Johnson said it's a good program because kids are always looking for a way out of class. The husband of one of his teachers works for Raytheon. The teacher shared with the class that volunteers are needed in the community's emergency preparedness program and that's how he learned about the CSEP program. Volunteers from St. Joseph's have done everything from portraying victims to working in the EOC, shelters and the JIC. The JIC volunteers learned about news releases, the Smart Book and EMIS. The volunteers also answered telephone calls, monitored the computers for updates and let the PIOs know about new information while they were in news conferences. Mr. Johnson said he feels that he has gained important personal knowledge and practical experience that will help him in his professional pursuits.

Presentation #2: Best Practices/Special Populations, Susan Cooper (Talladega County, AL PIO)

Talladega County has the largest special population in Alabama because of the Alabama Institute for the Deaf and Blind. Talladega County developed a Braille brochure because so many of their population couldn't use the regular CSEPP brochure. It is distributed through the school in enrollment packages, through the library and in new-hire (employee) packets. The goal is to let parents know what could happen and that EMA is ready to handle these events. For her large senior citizen population, Mrs. Cooper uses pill boxes as a leave behind for presentations. They also are in Braille. Tone alert radios (TARs) had to be adapted with strobe lights and Braille text box. These TARs are distributed throughout the campus and in the homes of those with special needs. Mrs. Cooper is working on individualized information for special populations which will be mailed to them. A recent Argonne National Laboratory study has enabled her to find people with special needs that the county didn't know about before the survey. Mrs. Cooper made available other materials for people to look at – historic homes calendar, coloring book, etc.

Discussion:

Steve Horwitz praised the brochure that Talladega County uses. Mrs. Cooper said the new brochure has been adapted to reflect TARs and SIP procedures. John Yaquiant asked how she distributed the coloring book. Mrs. Cooper said she gives it out when she does presentations at schools, fairs, etc. and she leaves them in libraries.

Presentation #3: Best Practices/Telephone Tracking, Marilyn Thompson, Pueblo Chemical Depot PAO

During exercises, multiple pieces of paper make it difficult to keep up with telephone calls and monitor them effectively. The Colorado JIC is at the University of Southern Colorado. It is a win/win situation because the university got upgrades of equipment that it couldn't otherwise afford and the CSEPP program gets a facility it couldn't get otherwise. Call takers use an automated telephone system to record information. Mrs. Thompson brought the program (on CD) for each site. Each telephone team member has a computer, phone and headset. Incoming calls are distributed among the staff so that one person isn't overwhelmed. Ideas from the old forms were taken and computerized so that telephone teams simply type in the information. Call takers always ask, "Have we answered all of your questions?" before ending the call. If the caller answers, "yes," the form gets filed automatically. If the answer is "no," the form is sent electronically to the appropriate PIO. If the call taker doesn't know which PIO can answer the question, the form is sent to all the PIOs who then determine which can best answer it. The form does get printed when it is completed. This method has proven effective for Colorado and has cut down on missed call backs.

TARs were distributed at Pueblo; a PIO went with the distribution team every time. It was a great way to spread the word to people. Recently, contaminated ground water went off post and the Army was going to provide bottled water to the community. But the depot had to let people

know about the problem first. They used the TARs to spread the word for Avondale water users. The TARs were used three times on Thursday night and three times on Friday for this situation.

Q & A

Q: Linda Zander, ANL, asked if the forms were being monitored and analyzed for trends.
A: Mrs. Thompson said the JIC manager analyzes these and provides any necessary feedback to the PIOs, spokespersons and telephone teams.

Q: Jan Finegan, Army Materiel Command (AMC) PAO, asked if an electronic file was also created or just on paper.
A: Anna Gonzales, Pueblo County EMA, said that an electronic database is created and stored.

Q: Someone asked if the telephone tracking system created a log.
A: Colorado did not believe so. Mrs. Gonzales said they had not paid for updates; individual sites would need to work with the programmer for updates.

Presentation #4: Best Practices/June Exercise Issues (Dennis Lindsey, Newport Chemical Activity PAO

All was going as planned prior to the start of the exercise. The exercise planners had decided to sound the sirens for real instead of simulating this as usual. Wrong messages went out over some of the sirens saying it was an actual event. Two towns partially evacuated. Real world media were covering the exercise; suddenly, they had a more interesting story to cover. Media went to the depot; the commander came out and talked to them right then. The JIS contacted other media not there and requested the media outlet to scroll on TV and announce on the radio that there was not an emergency; it was a test. The JIC became a real operating JIC. Mock media became part of the JIC staff. A real news conference was held. Mr. Lindsey provided a copy of a print news story and showed some of the TV coverage. During the "evacuation" a woman with a history of heart problems went to the hospital with chest pains. Lesson learned: Everyone doesn't read the paper, so they didn't see the ad/article about the siren test. We must use other means to let people know about things like this. That same day, it was discovered that a display of ton containers on the depot that the public has had access to for years may be contaminated. Depot officials decided to move the containers to a secure area for testing. The question was how to let their employees know without causing anxiety. Mr. Lindsey provided a copy of the memo the commander used.

Q & A

Steve Horwitz asked if an apology had been printed in the paper. Vicki Francis, Vermillion County PIO said one had been printed in the paper. Mark Shull, IEM, asked if there had been any follow-up with the media. Mr. Lindsey said they are planning an event for "the one-year anniversary of the oops." Mr. Lindsey said the company that installed the new sirens is checking the system. They are starting a weekly test of the sirens - first at the depot then adding the county sirens to the system. Marilyn Thompson, Pueblo Chemical Depot, asked how the site is going to

overcome the issue of people thinking every siren sounding is a test. Dennis said they're going to be working with/looking at Umatilla to see how they solved that problem. Cathy Coleman, Anniston Army Depot, commended the site (specifically Ray Colombo) for getting out the information right away and accepting responsibility. The room discussed how the pre-briefing helped the spokespeople get their points together and decided that an apology was necessary and helped shape that apology before the news conference.

Presentation #5: Best Practices/EAS Messaging (Michael Bryant, Madison Co., KY)

EAS messages are sent to the media in two parts. The pre-scripted standard EAS are sent out, then they pull the specific zone descriptions and fax those as well. These are already prepared and are kept in a notebook. The zone descriptions are designed for all media with extra large type for radio. Madison County also can cross reference zones by street and house number. Mr. Bryant provided handouts of these.

Presentation #6: Best Practices/Inter-agency Cooperation (John Healey, Maryland)

Maryland uses the JIC concept but also uses a near-site media center. Baltimore, Philadelphia and DC media are all within a 200-mile radius so Aberdeen would be overwhelmed. Maryland is training and using other state agencies such as Insurance Administration, Department of Environment, Department of Transportation, Public Service and Department of Corrections to help ease the load. The Corrections team has proved especially helpful. They exercise on their own regularly for all different kinds of emergencies and they exercise at the annual CSEPP exercise as part of the JIC and near-site media center. It's a two-way street – the State also helps Corrections when they need it. Government access cable TV has proved to be very helpful. A nice cross section of people have proved very valuable. JICsaw III training helps build their team as well as providing valuable training. Hurricanes, terrorism and hoof-and-mouth disease are some of the topics for exercises that they're working on these days. Mr. Healy encouraged the other states to develop similar partnerships.

Presentation #7: Best Practices/ Innovative Community Outreach (Korenza Burris, Benton Co., WA and Lenore Pointer, Morrow Co., OR)

Umatilla uses a team approach that includes two states, FEMA Region X and the depot. Some of the tools that have worked well for them are:

Event tracking – including the numbers of places they've gone, who was the target audience, and any special populations (language needs). Because they have so many events/functions going at any given time, they created an Event Coordination Sheet to coordinate with the seven agencies. With kids, they use the CSEPP Millionaire Game – this was Cheryl Humphrey's idea to go with Wally Wise Guy. Umatilla has a large Spanish-speaking population, so they need lots of interpreters. Everyone in the CSEPP program is white and from the government. This can be intimidating to the Hispanic population, so Umatilla has hired local individuals who speak Spanish to attend events with them and interpret.

Team Approach – they divided tasks by skill sets but still coordinated information with all. They are working on a new boat safety brochure – there's one river but three jurisdictions. Washington and Oregon merged two brochures into one to combine resources and information. They National Institute for Chemical Studies was brought in as a partner to answer questions regarding how well SIP will work. This has proved effective because these experts can tell residents about how SIP has proved effective in places all over the world. Steve Horwitz said the cohesiveness of this group has led to the success of this site.

Presentation #8: Best Practices/ Proactive Media Relations (Susan Huff, DCD and Paula Ernstrom, Utah Division of Comprehensive Emergency Management)

A new book, Target America: Terror at the 2002 Winter Olympics, features a terrorist parachuting onto the Depot, stealing chemical weapons and setting them off at the Olympics. The Deseret News is covering Olympic Security issues and wanted to get perspective from security experts about this book. Chris Kramer, Utah Olympic Public Safety Command PIO, told the reporter to call Ms. Ernstrom, Mrs. Huff and Wade Mathews (Tooele County PIO). Then Mr. Kramer called them to let them know the reporter would be calling. The three PIOs decided to be pro-active and called the reporter before he could call them. They used this as an opportunity to inform the reporter about what already existed to take care of emergencies now, and after, the weapons are gone. They discussed the factual problems in the book, and the reporter never ran a story about the book. It's interesting to note that you can't get the book unless you order it. The Tooele Transcript covers just about everything that happens at the depot. A Transcript reporter called about three weeks later. Ms. Ernstrom, Mrs. Huff and Mr. Mathews handled it the same way. This reporter is more in tune with what happens at the depot. He had read a good portion of the book and had far more in-depth questions. He interviewed the author of the book, Frederick W. Park, as well. His articles favored the Depot. The book review was not favorable to the book. Media attention surrounding the depot has increased a lot because of the Olympics. Using a team approach is helping them handle this well and has been a good reminder of the importance of the JIS. Marilyn Thompson brought up the point of what will happen to equipment once the chemicals are gone. The Army and FEMA won't be around to maintain this stuff. Ms. Ernstrom said they're dealing with that right now because many resources are being brought in specifically for the Olympics.

Presentation #9: Innovations and Technology: the 21st Century JIC (Jesse Seigal, FEMA Reg. X) and Cheryl Humphrey, Umatilla Co., OR)

What if the people we normally count on to run our JIC aren't available? How will we operate? The Umatilla Public Information Group decided to figure out how to work with people at other sites as a resource. They created "common folders" on the computer for information to which anyone/everyone needs access. In the media work area, they use a touch-screen kiosk so that media can access news releases and background information. Other electronic initiatives include posting news releases on the website and putting the smart book on the web (www.csepp.net) so that it can be used by remote staff. Umatilla County has given pagers to local media to contact them when there's an immediate need.

Remote JIC staff included two PIOs from other sites and an Incident Command PIO. Remote staff used Instant Messenger to have on-going conversations, and had separate chats going on simultaneously. Remote writers had a hard copy of the smart book but could also go on-line. This gave them site-specific information. News writers were brought in via telephone on JIC update meetings.

Response for both counties now comes from one place using the Incident Command System (ICS). The incident commander (IC) is about 60 miles from the JIC. Ms. Pointer was the IC/Field PIO. She initiates all EAS messages for both Oregon counties and has approval for all press releases for both Oregon counties. The JIC PIO now answers all media questions for both Oregon counties. Radio communication didn't work but e-mail did. Mrs. Humphrey writes any press releases that Ms. Pointer needs and coordinates them with her.

Video teleconferencing was used not for news conferences but to keep decision makers in the loop with one another and the IC. This became part of the decision-making process. Umatilla released people from shelter (19,000 people were sheltering.)

Lessons learned included: (1) Information flow needs a "traffic cop." Someone's entire job has to be to keep an eye on this and make sure people are aware of the latest information. (2) Year-round training of the core team is critical – there's a need to practice things that they sometimes just assume will work. Umatilla would like a full-time JIC manager to handle technology and training. (3) Information can be transmitted electronically more quickly if graphics are stripped from draft news releases. Fax will be backup there. (4) People need the right skills for the right job. They needed people who had more technology training about using the Internet.

Next Cyber Mission – CSEPP needs to be one team across the country with all the sites and pull from those resources. Umatilla wants to integrate more technology and use call takers remotely (in other states), improve and update what's there.

Q & A

Marilyn Thompson asked about legal review. Umatilla said the counties' decision has been that legal review does not have to happen prior to release. Alabama has attorneys in the JIC who look over news releases before they go out. John Yaquiant said SBCCOM has attorneys available.

Presentation #10: JIC Technology – ORISE (Chip Holquist, ORISE)

The Advanced JIC Course is a three-day course that will be held September 24-26, 2001, in Knoxville, Tenn. The course will teach technological tools to enhance communications and help you do your job more effectively. What kinds of solutions do you need? ORISE will give you ideas but you may have to come up with the solution. There will be two people per computer station so that you have some support. You'll learn about NetMeeting, but it may have a firewall issue. Challenges include lack of availability of broadband technology. The course will cover how to write for the web and how to develop a website with Microsoft Word within five minutes.

The Pointer Institute's Eye Track Study learned that most readers gloss over photos and graphics. People are looking for something specific. Good writing skills can't be ignored on the web. Graphics should be few and very relevant to the written information. Web Page Wizard is part of Office 2000 Microsoft Word. The program gives you various layout and linking options. The program appears to be a Power Point for web sites. It creates folders to keep things organized and handles file transfer protocol. NetMeeting comes with Office 2000 or can be downloaded from the Microsoft website. It allows you to see what the other person has on their screen; documents can be edited by multiple people from different locations; and it can be used as video conferencing. The course also covers high-speed briefing format, instant messenger, streaming video, and other technology-related items. Use hypertext to organize material, quote sources and material. Don't advertise on your web site.

Q & A

How do you register for the course? Bob Norville, FEMA Training, says go through your State and Regional folks. Marilyn Thompson, Pueblo Chemical Depot, asked if there were separate writers for the web and news releases. Jesse Seigal, FEMA Region X, recommended using the same information and modifying it by font color and/or type style.

Presentation #11: CSEPP Hotline (Linda Zander, ANL)

CSEPP Hotline is a new, versatile, interactive communications system developed by Argonne's Risk Communications program staff for the CSEPP public affairs community. It is designed to: increase communications among PAOs/PIOs; encourage sharing of products, tools, and ideas; inform PAOs/PIOs of activities and developments with program-wide implications (Congressional and HQ activities, medical developments, decisions, outreach campaigns, etc.); provide a forum for increased interaction, exchange of ideas and site-specific activities/issues, networking; and provide one-stop shopping for pictures, graphics, documents, products, contacts, news articles, video and other resources, including complimentary software

CSEPP Hotline is on-line 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It will be password protected. To get access you need to give your e-mail address so that we can let you know what the initial password is and give you password updates. This also puts your name in the Hotline Buddies list, under the topic "Contacts."

It is not a website although you access it through the Internet. First you need to install the software on your hard drive. The CD comes with written instructions on how to do this and has a user's manual. If you have firewalls to go through, you may need to go to the Options button, select Advanced, and select the http proxy option. Jesse Seigal used this option to get through new firewalls installed at his FEMA Region last week as did Susan Huff's computer security person at Deseret. We know there are new security firewalls being installed by the Army and we are working to resolve those issues.

You can chat and have private chats as well. The "files" button pulls up different information stored here. This system will be as valuable as you make it. That means the more you put into it, the more you'll get out of it.

Some of the topics in the Hotline are:

- Contacts – like the Resource Guide.
- CSEPP Calendar – exercise schedule plus training course information.

- For What it's Worth – interesting media information.

- Guidance and Regulations – policy papers, GAO Reports, etc.

- In The News – the latest in media coverage on CSEPP. We are seeking user input for this. We will also post items from the Program Manager's (PMCD's) clipping service. Note that there are subtopics for each community and "From Around The World."

- Mock Media Exercise Stories – We'll use this topic to post our mock media stories during CSEPP exercises. That means you'll have to go get them as you would in a real event instead of having them faxed to you. This will make the play more realistic. We tried it at the Umatilla exercise in May and it worked well. Eventually, we hope to be able to put our broadcast stories here – in video format, as well.

- Outreach Stuff You Can Use – Here we'll put things like the brochures, coloring and activity book, fact sheets and other program products. You can modify the fact sheets for your site as needed. There is a subtopic for each site. We're counting on users to share their own products with others. Modifying a product is easier, faster and less costly than building one from scratch. Your products may give other PIOs and PAOs good ideas, too. Note that we have a "videos" section where we list CSEPP videos that are available. That list will be in the training room with a sign-up sheet, for those of you who need copies.

- Photo & Video Library – This includes clip art, logos, pictures and a video preview section with things that you can use for presentations or other products. Again, we're counting on users to share photos, etc. with the rest of us.

- Public Affairs IPT – Find out what's going on with your IPT – meetings, conference calls, tasks, documents, etc.

- Questions & Suggestions – Here's where users can make suggestions, raise issues, offer opinions, etc. to the IPT, for Hotline, whatever. We can add as many subtopics as you want and need.

- Show & Tell – This is another place for sharing – what works and even what doesn't work. Give others the benefit of your experiences, lessons learned, products and ideas.

- Software – This topic includes software you may need or want, in different formats for PCs and Macs. This also is where we'll put updates of the Hotline software. New features are being added to the Hotline software.

- The Virtual JIC – This is for sharing emergency information plans, procedures, JIC checklists, Smart Books, Media Kits, MOUs & MOAs, etc. with other sites.

- Upload Files Here – This is for sending documents, etc. to Hotline. You can either drag a file to the subtopic or upload it using the upload button.

- What's New – This is where you keep folks up-to-date on what's going on at your site. There's also a subtopic for Army and FEMA HQ and general items.

We can add or change Hotline topics and subtopics as needed. We want your input and suggestions. Remember, this is your communications system. It's fun and exciting to use and will continue to grow offering us new features and options. However, like any other tool, it will be only as useful as we make it. The more you put into it, the more we all will get out of it.

Presentation #12: 2002 Olympics (Chris Kramer, Utah Olympic Public Safety)

The 2002 Olympic Games will be February 8-24, 2002, with 140 ticketed events, 70 medal events, 80 venues, 2 million tickets, and 70,000 new people a day in Utah. The Paralympics will be follow on March 7-16, 2002. Utah expects 40,000 spectators daily for these games. There are a wide variety of types of venues -- ice venues, snow venues (mountaintops must be secured), non-competition venues (airport, downtown, athletic village, medals plaza, etc.) community events, church events, and so on. This provides a Public Safety challenge – protect the games from unknown risks, maintain daily community services, maintain an environment consistent with the spirit of the Games and the image of the United States.

Threat is inherent in a worldwide event. Potential threats include hoaxes, minor injuries, intellectual property rights, minor criminal activity, transportation issues, weather, public health concerns, civil unrest (world stage), information system attacks and terrorism. The Utah Legislature created a law to meld all jurisdictions into one. This has never been done anywhere before. Local jurisdictions retain control and responsibility, the Salt Lake Olympic Committee just coordinates everything. There are 14 local, state and federal law enforcement agencies. Atlanta tried to do it with 100 agencies and it didn't work. Others have regular input, but Utah's command of the public safety committee has 20 people.

Work started on the public information plan in 1998. The public information subcommittee represents all levels of government and covers all aspects of the state and games. Media attention is increasing now. There are lots of issues that will interest the media – Dugway, Deseret, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and a nuclear reactor at the University. The JIC will be in the basement of the state capitol. The JIS will operate all the time and will be a team effort. Full-scale operations begin January 2002 and shut down March 20. Federal headquarters are being briefed now so that they know how the JIC works and their part in it.

When the national media start focusing on Deseret Chemical Depot, the local media in the other CSEPP states are likely to pick up on the story as well. All sites need to take a look at this and be prepared. Anticipate these stories to start in December/January.

Presentation #13: Ready, Set, Act! (Mark Shull, IEM)

Ready, Set, Act! is the new theme. "Ready" = Learn about the hazard and what you need to do to be safe. "Set" = Prepare the plan, make your kits. "Act" = Do what you need to do to be safe – shelter or evacuate. The IPT wants quarterly surveys at each site to track progress.

Key concepts of the plan include: Begin communicating where the public mindset is – analyze our products and messages to see if we are doing this. Activate the active people – reach the centers of influence in a community and educate them so that they can educate the people around them. Establish consistent message and tone – to encourage dialogue not arguments. People-centered not CSEPP-centered – put the focus on the public. Measurable results – to satisfy regulatory requirements.

We need input from all sites – it's not just the IPT that creates ideas. Based on studies, we know that media interest increases the closer a site gets to destroying its stockpile. Therefore, money should be structured so that major public affairs funding builds before the time and is highest during demil then drops back down as demil wraps up. Budget planning is in process.

Measuring results: The IPT has begun work on developing a baseline survey. Additional funding from FEMA will be required to conduct these surveys.

Closing Remarks and Discussion:

Steve Horwitz and John Yaquiant gave closing remarks. There are two public affairs breakouts over the next two days. During the State Directors briefing, Russ Salter said he appreciated the work of the public affairs teams across the country, is pleased with the progress of IPT, and funding is an issue. Mr. Horwitz committed to send the IPT minutes to each state director. Mark Shull, IEM cautioned that minutes record everything - even ideas under consideration. His concern is that something in the minutes may be taken out of context or cause concern. Mr. Shull encouraged the IPT to follow-up these minutes with phone calls and further communication with State Directors.

2 OPENING PLENARY SESSION

2.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks

The conference began with welcoming remarks by Beverlee E. Venell, Commander Intergovernmental Services Bureau, Oregon State Police, Russell Salter, Director of the FEMA Chemical and Radiological Preparedness Division, and Denzel Fisher of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health (OASA(ESOH)).

Ms. Venell welcomed the group to Portland. She went on to explain that a new organization, the Oregon Governing Board, has been formed to assist Oregon in preparing for a CSEPP incident. The Governing Board includes representatives from the key agencies involved in emergency preparedness and incinerator permitting. The Board has made great strides in clearing management problems and misunderstandings between organizations.

Mr. Salter welcomed the group and highlighted some of the program's accomplishments since the last National Conference, including IPT work, the CSEPP Planners website, and developments in the shelter-in-place field and in exercise program evaluation. The CSEP Program continues to set precedents and establish standards for other emergency management programs to emulate. He then presented awards to the following persons who have made great contributions to the CSEP program: Mr. Dave McMillion, State Director of Maryland Emergency Management, Mrs. Sandra Hensley, Arkansas Department of Emergency Management, Gwen Mooney, Sinclair County, Alabama Office of Emergency Management, Mr. Steve Cobota, Washington State CSEPP Coordinator, and the members of the Oregon Governing Board.

Mr. Fisher gave his welcome to all and thanked the state and local governments in the CSEPP Community for their support and contributions to the program. He also gave personal thanks to a number of key individuals who have contributed greatly to the program's development.

2.2 Topical Presentations

Presentations were given on key areas of program development over the past year.

Presentation #1: CSEPP Training Activities (Bob Norville, FEMA HQ)

Mr. Norville first described the training course schedule. The training course schedule has to be coordinated with public affairs training, medical training, and exercises. There are a number of blackout dates due to conflicts with other activities. He then talked about new courses and products, the CSEPP training web, CSEPP curriculum, and training gaps.

New courses and products include Version 2 of Agent Characteristics, Toxicity, First Aid and Special Treatment (ACTFAST) course; the emergency planner's companion CD-ROM on

worker operations and evacuee support; Re-ACTFAST 2 video- and DVD-based refresher training; and the revised training crosswalk.

The CSEPP Training Web was initiated in March 1999 and is hosted at: http://emc.ornl.gov. It is one of the major mechanisms for distributing CSEPP training documents and related CSEPP information. Its success is measured by the number of downloads of training courses and other materials, which is summarized in the following table.

Document Type	Downloads Last Quarter	Total Downloads
Tech Reports	2,963	17,717
Training Course	3,531	16,950
Job Aids	804	4,259
Program Documents	2,445	9,927
Total	9,743	48,853

Mr. Norville went through the most popular download items for the last quarter and total to date. Some of the more popular items have been downloaded a few thousand times.

Some of the CSEPP-developed training products have become popular outside of the CSEPP community; for example the Oak Ridge Evacuation Modeling System course has been used by nuclear utilities and by Texas A&M for coastal evacuation studies.

Current training works in progress include a revised CSEPP JIC Advisor course, revised Exercise Evaluator course, revised PPE classroom course, emergency planner's companion on communications, and a shelter-in-place training video. There is a new proposal for a medical training course for paramedics and hospital staff covering protocols for treatment of chemical agent exposure injuries.

Presentation #2: Medical Meeting (Lisa Hammond, FEMA Region VI)

Ms. Hammond gave a CSEPP medical update including outcomes from the 2000 medical conference, activities since the conference, and an overview of current medical training support.

At the 2000 medical conference the conferees adopted a set of nine best practices relating to decontamination, triage, toxicological treatment, and administrative support. They also identified open issues including the possibility of a medical IPT, whether there should be two medical meetings per year, and the possibility of pediatric auto-injectors.

A survey was conducted to determine the need for an IPT or work groups on medical issues. In response to the survey, six MQITs were established on specific topics:

communications, threat assessment; protection and equipment; training and exercises; standardization; and performance measures. Recruiting and organization of the teams is still in progress. The Communications MQIT will oversee development and maintenance of the CSEPP Medical webpage. The Standardization MQIT will be the overarching clearinghouse for medical recommendations.

A medical page has been developed and implemented on the CSEPP Planners website. It contains links to medical resources websites, CSEPP documents, and reports, and also features a chat room and bulletin board for exchange of information.

At the Noble training center, they have developed the "Integrated Health and Medical WMD Course." It is intended for EMS and hospital personnel including physicians, nurses, and hospital administrators. It is available at no cost.

A summary was given of recent medical training and exercise support activities. Almost every CSEPP state received training within the last year. Evaluators or observers were sent to seven exercises and evaluators will be sent to exercises in September and October of this year.

The 2001 pre-conference meeting featured a demonstration of the medical web page and interactive web-based medical training, a presentation on the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) role in the Chem Demil program, and discussion of medical performance measures.

Presentation #3: Planning and Program Integration (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ, and Dennis Legel, SBCCOM)

CSEPP is a "system of systems" that combine to produce maximum protection: public awareness, training, exercises, infrastructure, medical and policy. Planning is the thread that ties them all together.

A planning conference was held in Dallas in November 2000 to discuss unresolved planning issues. The conference participants identified 41 unresolved planning issues and resulted in the formation of working groups on the following topics:

- Sheltering in Place (chaired by Marianne Rutishauser, Tooele County Emergency Management). This group has been working on evacuation vs. sheltering, when and how to terminate SIP, and handling of people following termination of SIP.

- Plan coordination/integration, which soon merged with the planning performance/ measurement working group. This group has been addressing coordination and integration of plans, definition of non-surety events and notification criteria, definition of key terms such as a "complete" and "coordinated" plan. Doug Becvar of FEMA Region VIII and Joe Herring of FEMA HQ are the co-chairs of this group.

- Development of a planning website (chaired by Joe Herring). This group developed a website to support CSEPP planners with information, references, and a chance to share example plans, best practices, and ideas.

- Reentry and recovery (chaired by Steve Douglas of Pueblo County Emergency Management). This group has looked at issues of reentry and recovery planning, use of monitoring and modeling to identify restricted areas, and definition of criteria for "clearing" an area.

The working groups have produced draft or model products addressing these issues. The CSEPP Planners Website is up and running. A medical section is due to be added to it. The next planning conference will be December 4-6 in Perdido Beach, Alabama.

Presentation #4: Public Outreach (Steve Horwitz, FEMA HQ, and John Yaquiant, SBCCOM)

The public outreach IPT includes four County representatives, two State, three from FEMA and 5 from the Army. The IPT vision is a public that can and will act appropriately upon notification of an emergency at a chemical installation. The IPT strategy is to develop a framework of good practices and products that each site can adapt and customize to fit their needs. The IPT has sought to draw on best practices and experience gained at the farthest-ahead sites.

The coordinated campaign uses a three-step them for public awareness: ready, set, act. Being ready means knowing your role in an emergency, how to get information, knowing your zone, and what protective action to take. Being set means having the tools to take action: a family plan, a tone-alert radio (TAR) and a shelter-in-place kit. Act means to respond appropriately to instructions: evacuate or shelter.

The Public Outreach IPT is working with the SIP working group to develop appropriate public education materials about sheltering in place. A special joint session of the two groups was held in June of 2001.

Coming products in public outreach include an SIP/Protective Action video, a coloring book, and fact sheets on CD-ROM with information on chemical agents, protective action strategies and joint information centers. The fact sheets area available in draft form for comment; target completion date is the end of FY 2001.

The IPT also has several initiatives relating to use of technology in public outreach, including the advanced JIC course, which focuses on use of newer technologies, and initiatives on hotlines and the "cyber JIC."

The Umatilla Pilot Media/Outreach Campaign completed implementation this year. It resulted in statistically significant increases in public knowledge, as measured by survey, with respect to public confidence in knowing what to do in an emergency. Lessons learned from the

pilot include the importance of a cohesive PIO team and use of multiple performance measures to gauge the program's visibility and impact.

The primary issue coming out of discussion in the public outreach pre-conference meeting is funding for implementation of public outreach campaigns. Sites have drawn up contingency budge estimates/justifications for FY 03 to 07. CSEPP senior management supports funding of media campaigns; however actual funding will depend on many factors.

3 BREAKOUT SESSIONS

A total of 16 breakout sessions were held on July 25 and 26 on eight topics. Following are summaries of the presentations and discussion in the breakout sessions. For the convenience of the reader, in general all sessions on each topic have been combined into one summary. The exception is the medical sessions, each of which featured different presentations on different topics; the medical breakout sessions are each summarized separately.

3.1 Automation

Two breakout sessions were held on automation. This summary combines the presentations and discussion from both sessions.

Presentation #1: Automation (Darius Kwiedorowicz, SBCCOM)

Mr. Kwiedorowicz discussed the year in review. Major topics were implementation of the Automation IPT recommendations, FEMIS training for key on-post personnel, Commanders' recommendation, response from the Department of the Army, and CSEPP automation status.

The Automation IPT recommended adoption of a single system based on FEMIS. SBCCOM was following a Year 2 implementation plan for release of FEMIS 1.4.7 which was released in May 2000. This release has been installed at four sites: ANCA, UMCD, DCD and ECA. Training materials have been updated. Key on-post personnel have been trained. An effort was made to concentrate the training on the installations' needs: daily operations, response, notification, and system administration.

A survey was prepared that compared FEMIS to EMIS. Commanders were tasked to provide position statements about their preference for EMIS or FEMIS. All eight site commanders recommended EMIS as the single system. The Commander, SBCCOM, concurred in a letter to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (ESOH) dated 11 Oct 2000, indicating that the focus needs to be on prompt notification, that most off-post jurisdictions want to use the same system as on-post, and that the Command can only afford to integrate D2-Puff once. The response from the Department of the Army concurred with the position to retain EMIS for on-post CSEPP requirements, but non-concurred with discontinuing FEMIS, and called for independent test and evaluation. SBCCOM was directed to support both EMIS and FEMIS in their current status. An independent evaluation by the U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity (AMSAA) is to assess EMIS-EMIS, EMIS-FEMIS, and FEMIS-FEMIS, and the need and cost associated with integrating D2-Puff.

CSEPP automation status is that EMIS Release 3.2 is installed at all EMIS sites. It is mainly a maintenance release to support Solaris 7. FEMIS Release 1.4.7.2 is installed at Utah, Oregon/Washington and Maryland. Installation is in progress in Alabama and Colorado, but not anticipated for other installations. Release 1.4.7.2 changes include drag and drop on the GIS, single user/multiple user logins allowed, ton container selection brings up the quantity of interest,

and PARs and PADs are automatically named. This release also changes record locking, requires administrator privileges to delete D2 cases, and supports Windows 2000. FEMIS Release 1.5 is expected in December 2001.

Q & A

Q: Joseph Fletcher State of Utah Division of Comprehensive Emergency Management: When will the independent evaluation be conducted?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: That is being negotiated now.

Q: Thomas Shepherd, State of Colorado Office of Emergency Management – Will the Automation Working Group be involved?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: Expect that group to help in the near future on the evaluation.

Q: J. Fletcher: Is there a plan to use the scoreboard feature?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: Yes, but my firewall won't let me use it.

Q: T. Shepherd: Will COTS be evaluated too?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: No.

Q: Valerie Eveland, Benton County Emergency Services, Washington: How do we budget for software?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: We don't plan on changing software. 1.5 doesn't require new software. All new PCS come with Windows 2000.

Q: (audience) Are there issues between Windows 2000 and ArcView?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: No.

Q: Casey Beard, Morrow County Emergency Management, Oregon: Is there funding for integration of D2-Puff into FEMIS or EMIS?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: PM CSEPP will absorb the cost of integrating D2-Puff. There will be no site costs. Your budget will involve your personnel costs associated with using the model.

Q: C. Beard: Do you have funds for the integration of D2-Puff into the existing models?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: I don't have any budget surplus.

Q: Allen Jakobitz, Washington State Emergency Management: Can I run both versions of ArcView on one PC?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: There is no problem using ArcView versions with Windows 2000.

Q: Allen Jakobitz: When did that get solved?
A: Blanche Wood, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory: We have been working that problem.
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: I have two versions of ArcView running on my computer at the same time without problems.

Q: Donald Broughton, Madison County, Kentucky, Emergency Management: We on the Automation Working Group gave a vision for the path forward. What is the validity of the Working Group's work?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: It is up in the air. We had six IPT meetings over the months and marched out on our implementation plan and it didn't succeed.

Comment: D. Broughton: We had a process with fairly equal representation by the on- and off-post communities on the Working Group that formed after the Automation IPT. I think the Working Group could help facilitate solving these problems.

Comment: J. Fletcher: We have been through this process twice. Each time we get it changed at the national level before our recommendations are implemented. By the time we get to some accepted solution CSEPP will be over and we won't need it. I have had eleven years of frustration.

Q: H. Hoffman, AMC Surety Field Activity: What is the point of the independent study?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: That will be covered in the next presentation.

Presentation #2: Independent Evaluation of CSEPP Automated Information System (Ron Cammarata, U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity (AMSAA))

AMSAA is the Army's independent analysis agency. It has been designated the independent evaluator for Chemical Demilitarization – sort of the honest broker for Demil. We are part of AMC but independent of SBCCOM. The study was directed by the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (Operations Research) and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health). The issue is about two systems, EMIS and FEMIS. We were tasked by the Army to take another look at problems related to implementing the two systems and the differences between them. AMSAA was directed to look at three options: EMIS on and off-post, FEMIS on and off-post, and EMIS on-post with FEMIS off-post The original Congressional requirement was for one system. The Automation IPT recommended that FEMIS be selected as the single system. The depots do not want to stop using EMIS. The question is what is appropriate for adoption for use by both on- and off-post users. Do we need the same system in both places, or can we have two? We are proposing a three-phase approach to look at the systems in a logical order. If at any point we feel that we have sufficient information to recommend a solution to the Army, we will make that recommendation and won't necessarily complete the whole process. The current requirements appear to be a list of what everyone wants for the system. There may not be a real need for all of the requirements.

First we are going to look at the requirements for the systems, then we will see if sufficient information already exists to make a determination about the systems meeting requirements. As a final resort we may have to go for more information. Initially we want to determine if there is a problem. Given the strong opinion from the depots in support of continuing to use EMIS, we want to see if EMIS can meet the requirements of the off-post users. We may use a questionnaire to determine what they have now. Can you accept EMIS as your only off-post system? If we find that there isn't a problem with this, without regard to what the IPT recommended, the problem

may be solved. Some depots feel that they didn't have enough input into the requirements when the IPT recommended adoption of FEMIS. We would then review the IPT deliberations to determine the minimum requirements necessary to meet users' needs. If there is reason to continue after that (disconnects between on- and off-post) we would go further to make an independent determination of the needs of users and how these systems might meet these needs. If we still don't think we have enough information to make a recommend to the Army we will recommend further testing and functional checks or side-by-side comparisons, including consideration of human factors, training requirements, user interfaces, etc. This would be the most expensive option. The Electronics Proving Ground at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, is the site for such testing if it is required. We think that phase one would take four months, phase two, looking at additional information, another four months, and another four months would be necessary if additional testing is required. This totals about a year. This is our basic proposal to the Army. It has not been approved. Some, all, or none of the proposal may be approved. We are also tasked to look into D2-Puff integration, including cost, difficulty to integrate D2-Puff into either model, and is there a need to integrate D2-Puff into the system.

Q & A

Q: (audience): If you have studies already you may have data, but to determine the needs of the users, toss out the studies and start with a survey of user needs. Then see if the models will meet the identified needs.
A: Ron Cammarata: If the issue has already been decided there may be no need to do the study. If we go ahead, please be assured that we have no prior bias.

Q: J. Fletcher: I am concerned that the only off-post input is through the survey. There is no face-to-face interaction or discussion with users. A survey can be manipulated to get the results the Army wants.
A: R. Cammarata: My involvement in this project has been about three weeks. I don't know the history. We work for the Army, but we pride ourselves on our independence.

Q: J. Fletcher: The on-post users want EMIS so they will try to sell it off-post. I don't object to using EMIS if I don't have to give up the functionality of FEMIS.
A: R. Cammarata: We feel that if there is some expression by the off-post community that they need FEMIS we will start from that premise.
Comment - J. Fletcher: That has already been established.
A: R. Cammarata: We have just been tasked with this. The indication is that the Army hasn't decided the issue yet.

Q: C. Beard: Where is FEMA in this? Where is their involvement? I tend to be suspicious of all the people in green making the decisions.
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: In the Army/FEMA MOA the Army is responsible for automation.

Comment: Valerie Eveland, Benton County, WA: Automation hasn't been going anywhere.

Comment: Robert Brown, Indiana State EMA: Go to end users to find out what they need.

A: R. Cammarata: On-post users seem to feel that their needs haven't been represented.

Q: David Miller, Applied Computing Systems, Inc.: Who is going to approve your proposal?
A: R. Cammarata: The Deputy Undersecretary of the Army.

Comment: (audience) People at that level aren't affected. They don't have a say.

Comment: D. Broughton: We have an open proposal. It would be appropriate to include an evaluation of integration of the TSIP (the shelter-in-place proof of concept model) model's principles so we can get SIP recommendation from the model. There are a lot of people in the Automation Work Group. Didn't we have a balanced group? It was close to 50/50 on- and off-post. We have worked on that for years and we have a product. We broke it down between implementation and training on how to move forward. We need to look at that as part of the process. The Working Group, or some portion of it, should be involved in your process. I don't feel the same distrust that some others have voiced. But I think it is a real possibility if all you do is survey as you have in the past.
A: R. Cammarata: We see the questionnaire as only two or three questions, not the extended questionnaire you have been asked to complete in the past.

Comment: D. Broughton: As they are saying, the issue is mistrust due to past experience with survey results not being meaningful.
A: R. Cammarata: – Our Command wants a technical recommendation.

Comment: D. Broughton: We can do it in a week if you get us together.
A: R. Cammarata: Getting together might be all that is needed. I would suggest to Darius that, if we get together, those who are in a position to cry "foul" later should participate, and the rest of this may be irrelevant.

Q: R. Cammarata: Can the status quo work? Depot users have stated, through their chain of command, that they want to keep EMIS. What do we do?
A: Bob Brown: The Army's needs are met with EMIS. Some off-post users like EMIS, but want to add features. Others want FEMIS. I want something my counties can use that is not particularly complicated. I don't need all that complexity. Microsoft software lets you use it in a couple of key strokes.

Comment: Martha Doherty, Morrow County Emergency Management, Oregon: There is a problem. Morrow County will never agree to step back from FEMIS. Suggest that since the Army has never used FEMIS, unplug EMIS for six months and let the Army see how FEMIS works.

Comment: Bob Brown: The off-post community hasn't used EMIS either.

Q: C. Beard: Isn't there a congressional requirement for adoption of one system? Can't we go back to Congress and get them to permit two systems. On our site, if we have to go to other than

FEMIS we will go to the Governor and say we are not ready to go ahead with incineration and won't be for two years.
A: R. Cammarata: It might well be our recommendation that we don't go through a year long process.

Comment: (audience) It seems that we are all hung up on two systems. The only reason we have two is because we have two subcontractors. Have one subcontractor make them into one system. Make an interface between the two and call it one system and go.

Q: H. Hoffman: If this is approved, will efforts to integrate D2-Puff be halted.
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: Yes, efforts are halted now.

Q: M. Doherty: There have already been three questionnaires ranking the importance of the requirements. How will you arrive at the essential requirements?
A: R. Cammarata: There is a tendency to put in requirements that are good and list them as necessary when they are not.

Comment: M. Doherty: And now you may ask us to rank the requirements again in a questionnaire.
A: R. Cammarata: Questionnaire may not be the best way. It is good to get the people in a room and develop consensus.

Q: Audience: Has there ever been a controlled test that compared the 2 systems?
A: R. Cammarata: We would recommend doing a test like that if speed of notification is the critical requirement. We must identify the one and only key issue.

Comment: H. Hoffman: It is not just looking at the software. You must look at training, retention of training, etc. You must look at all of these issues.
A: R. Cammarata: Yes, we must look at all of these issues.

Q: M. Doherty: If the study is done, what if they want to stay at the status quo? Is it possible to maintain the two systems?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: The program does not have a budget in the LCCE large enough to support two systems and does not have funds to do Puff work in the two systems. The budget would have to be increased or the level of support would have to go down.

Comment: (audience) You may need to look at a fourth option of a web based system, the state directors are frustrated. The IPT, is that the Automation IPT?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: Yes, basically the IPT has closed, but it did recommend a working group.

Q: (audience) When will the Automation IPT be cranked up again?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: The Automation working group was to help implement the IPT recommendation. When the decision came in doubt the purpose of the group came in doubt. The group will meet again if the evaluation goes as proposed.

Comment: (audience) Umatilla is looking at demilitarization starting next year. If the study takes a year, they will be in demilitarization operations before a decision is made. The proposed timeline is almost too late.

Presentation #3: D2-Puff (Mike Myirski, SBCCOM PM-CSEP)

Our office at SBCCOM is the proponent for hazard prediction models for chemical stockpile and non-stockpile. As the model proponent, our role is to develop, maintain, and provide training. The Department of Army (DA) Safety Office accredits the model. The current accredited model is called D2PCw also known as D2. The replacement is D2-Puff. As the proponent for hazard prediction models we advise Army departments that accredit the models. Our office doesn't have the authority to approve any models. We develop them and recommend them. We also cannot dictate to the sites which model to use. DA Safety does that. They put out the regulations and accredit the models. We are in the process of getting DA Safety accreditation for D2-Puff. D2 is accredited for all uses at all sites: exercises, planning, training and accidents. D2-Puff is installed at five sites: Umatilla, Deseret, Blue Grass, Pine Bluff, and Anniston, and is approved for use in training, exercises, and planning, but not actual accidents. It is expected to be fully accredited for all uses at UMCD, DCD, and ANCA in the next few weeks. Once we get final accreditation for D2-Puff, we will field it to the remaining chemical depots or activities. Our office will not dictate to the depot commanders that they must use D2-Puff. The commanders can choose to continue using D2. Some communities have said they will not accept the output from models they don't have themselves. Our goal is to replace D2 with D2-Puff, but for the foreseeable future D2 will also be accredited.

Q & A

Q: Jimmy Carson, Deseret Chemical Depot: Will we provide the accredited model to the off-post communities?
A: M. Myirski: Yes, it is installed in the Umatilla Community for a six week evaluation and it is being well accepted at this point. We will install it within the communities as well as at the depots.

Q: Audience: Could D2-Puff remain as a stand-alone.
A: M. Myirski: Yes, the output files are Adobe Acrobat files. It is possible to use this model and keep it a stand-alone model. However, several sites say that they will have to have it integrated into the system before they can accept it for use at their site. It will be a site specific decision. The commanders can decide which model they will use after the model is fully accredited. Eventually D2-Puff will replace D2PCw at all sites. Both systems will be accredited eventually.

Presentation #4: D2-Puff (Erwin T. Prater, IEM, Inc.)

Mike Myirski introduced Erwin Prater, IEM, to brief the group about D2-Puff. He is one of the developers of the model, one of the primary trainers for the model, and was a staff meteorologist at one of the storage sites too.

Erwin Prater - We have done a D2, D2-Puff comparison. D2-Puff considers wind shifts, terrain features, wind forecasts, and all available wind readings. D2 considers one wind reading at a time and assumes that the earth is flat. (A brief demonstration shows a D2-Puff plume compared with a D2 plume. The D2-Puff plume curves to accommodate the wind changes, D2 requires another run generating another plume and adding to the hazard wedge). Recent additions to D2-Puff include in-shelter information, e.g., schools and other facilities. It can specify building-specific leakage rates and predictions of in-building dosage that accumulates after the plume has passed. (A brief demonstration showed the dosage animation and concentration animation capabilities.) Another demonstration used Pine Bluff Arsenal to show an animated wind shift over time, and demonstrate animated dosage and concentrations. Concentrations look like a floating bubble following the wind plume path. He also demonstrated the D2-Alarm. It provides a "clean" map of affected zones, arrival and departure times of the plume in real time, and is adaptable to other hazard models. The color of the zones changes on IRZ/PAZ map indicating arrival and departure by zone. Green indicates that the plume has left the zone, red indicates that the plume is now in the zone, yellow indicates the next zone the plume will reach.

We now have more information for in-shelter dosages. The information can be put in ahead of time and D2-Puff can predict indoor dosage and what the additional dosage will be if they stay in shelter after the plume has passed. Puff makes snap shots of the plume and it goes through the snap shots when it plays the plume travel back for you. This shows the life of the dosage plume.

D2-Puff was validated by Dugway Proving Grounds in 1999, comparing it with D2PC and actual field experiments. They found D2-Puff more realistic, with significant improvements (terrain features, additional meteorological information, etc), safe sided, and a more usable graphical user interface. They recommended that D2-Puff be accredited for use in emergency response, operational planning and training.

D2-Puff has been accredited and accepted by DA Safety and PM-CSEPP for use at stockpile sites for planning, training, and exercises. U.S. Army Nuclear and Chemical Agency is monitoring the transition from D2C to D2-Puff for DA Safety.

Q & A

Q: D. Broughton: Is it correct to say that dosage plumes show more accurate ending of the plume than concentration contours?
A: M. Myirski: Puff provides a more accurate depiction of actual behavior of chemicals in the atmosphere, but is still conservative (vs. realistic), so Puff is less conservative than D2PC, and therefore more accurate than D2.

Q: D. Broughton: Does Puff accommodate AEGLs accurately?
A: M. Myirski: Puff has AEGL capability and will correctly portray them.

Comment: E. Prater: The code is in there. You can select it.
Comment: M. Myirski: Writing code for non-linear functions isn't easy.

Comment: E. Prater: Yes, but we put together a team of mathematicians and meteorologists and we did it.

Q: C. Beard: Using Puff alone we can tell people when to ventilate, what about the other stand-alone shelter-in-place model TSIP? Is there any point in comparing them?
A: D. Broughton: We already have done that. They work ok. The way you make decisions is different, but you can take the same fundamental assumptions and easily make the changes here.
A: E. Prater: The nuts and bolts are already in Puff. I think TSIP would be a great training tool. It would be fairly easy to use it by itself.

Q: J. Fletcher: Can the model accommodate other agents?
A: E. Prater: Yes, as long as they don't behave as a heavy gas.
A: M. Myirski: It will not accommodate biological agents. This is a vapor model. Biological agents are aerosols.

Q: J. Fletcher: Concerning the legacy of a single hazard prediction system, we need a model that can accommodate biological as well as chemical agents.
A: M. Myirski: We will be leaving this model for you, but we can't provide a biological hazard prediction model.

Comment: Thomas Warnock, FEMA Headquarters CSEPP: But this model can be adapted to handle industrial chemicals.

Comment: M. Myirski: We could add a biological module, but we are not funded to do that.

Comment: J. Fletcher: I am concerned about using Puff for other than CSEPP applications.

Comment: E. Prater: D2Puff only works for neutrally buoyant gasses. Many industrial chemicals are dense gases which are not neutrally buoyant. Some industrial chemicals are neutrally buoyant and the model could work with them.

Q: C. Beard: The depot will be allowed to continue with D2. It appears that there are some days when you get a different PAR from Puff or D2.
A: M. Myirski: Martha Doherty knows you can manipulate this by selecting among weather sources.

Comment: C. Beard: we may find ourselves disagreeing with the Depot PAR. I would like to see some effort to get us to use the same model on- and off-post.

Comment: M. Myirski: We will be encouraging the Commanders to use Puff. At some point we will stop funding training, maintenance, etc., for D2. We will not dictate to the commanders which model they are required to use.

Comment – D. Broughton – Casey, update one of the existing MOAs to address which model will be used, or develop a new MOA about which model will be used and how. We need to work this out with each community.

Q: (audience) How do we use Puff for sheltering-in-place?
A: E. Prater: You have special facilities and zones that may require sheltering. Puff gives arrival and departure times for zones and facilities that may be used for assisting making decisions about sheltering-in-place as a PAR/PAD. You can enter site specific information for special facilities.

Q: V. Eveland: About EMIS/FEMIS. The thing I have heard repeatedly is that FEMIS is too slow for the Depot. Could they have a scaled down version of FEMIS that might go faster? Would that provide everybody with what they need?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: No. There are two separate functions. Commanders are indicating that 15 or 30 seconds are important to them. Scaling down will not help. Features not being used are not slowing the model. Then, Blanch, why is FEMIS slow?
A: Blanche Wood, PNNL: I don't know if there is a specific thing that causes FEMIS to be slower than EMIS.

Comment: V. Eveland: We should be asking how we can make one of these systems work for everybody. Umatilla is going to be all done with demilitarization before we get anywhere.

Comment: D. Kwiedorowicz: I share your fear.

Q: George Krock, Maryland Emergency Management Agency: If the wind does change directions, should not the plume come from the point source?
A: E. Prater: In this case, it is an instantaneous release and an evaporative release. The wind shift occurred after the evaporation had completed. A specific case with long term evaporation will be shown later.

Q: Larry Skelly, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (ESOH): Is the probability for the plume to be inside the red line (i.e., risk envelope) the same for Puff and D2?
A: M. Myirski: We expect a greater probability of the plume being inside the red lines for Puff.

Q: L. Skelly: The concentration denoted was IDLH (immediately dangerous to life and health), can the system use AEGLs?
A: E. Prater: Yes, we are still using the Army Safety Office approved concentrations. You can change to AEGLs as soon as the Army Safety Office approves the AEGL concentrations.

Q: M. Doherty: You said it updates every 15 minutes and you said it is real time, which is it?
A: E. Prater: You can update it at any time, but it has new met data every 15 minutes. It also updates every minute for certain functions; the update frequency can be set by the user.

Q: L. Skelly: What level of platform is required?
A: M. Myirski: The same as the automation system for EMIS or FEMIS. Martha has run FEMIS and Puff on the same PC at the same time and has had no problems.

Comment: M. Doherty indicated no performance issues on the current platform.

Q: from the audience: Can it run on a 486?
A: E. Prater: We do not know. A lot of development was done on 350 MHZ machines.

Q: L. Skelly: What will it take to integrate Puff into EMIS or FEMIS?
A: D. Kwiedorowicz: That depends on the system. It will be very challenging to do it twice, 3 to 4 times as expensive because of the brand new interface between the 2 systems. It is not an easy task. Integrating Puff once will be much more straight forward.

3.2 Exercise and Training

This summary combines the presentations and discussion from the two exercise and training breakout sessions during the conference.

Robert Norville provided opening remarks and speaker introductions for the exercise and training sessions. He stated a need for attendee input on training and exercises issues that needed to be addressed or areas needing enhancement. Paul Leykamm of SBCCOM asked if a matrix could be developed that would identify training required and available for specific job descriptions. Mr. Norville indicated some work was already being done within the Training Matrix already, but he would ensure this would be expanded.

Presentation #1: Advanced JIC Course (JIC Technology in the 21st Century), Chip Hultquist and Jim Noey, Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Technology Education (ORISE)

The Advanced JIC Course will be taught at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, September 24, 25, and 26, 2001. The course will teach the use of technology to bridge communication gaps. Focus will be on the use of technology in three areas: news releases for the internet; creating Web Pages; and the use of NetMeeting. It will show how to write for the Internet and how to develop a web site using MS Word 2000. MS Word 2000 is on most PCs and can be used to develop a site in a timely, efficient and inexpensive manner. The course will also show how MS NetMeeting can be used to link people together to share information. It can link people together point-to-point. The system turns over control to the speaker. The course is not a replacement for the original JIC course, but a course that focuses on the use of technology to pull locations together and enhance JIC operations.

The course will focus on the technical tools. It will not teach the functional public information techniques found in JICsaw III. The course is designed to give an understanding of what can be done with modern computer-based tools. Umatilla has used the tools to create a cyber-JIS. They have taken the information from the course and used it to develop a system. The goal is to learn to use available and inexpensive tools to solve communications challenges. Many people that go to the course are inhibited about using the computers. The students are partnered for class work to make it easier and to communicate with each other in real time. They will use

NetMeeting; a free Microsoft product. It comes as part of Office 2000 and can be downloaded free if you do not have Office 2000.

In writing for the Internet, the course will discuss how people follow information on the computer. Studies have found that people focus on headlines, news briefs, and captions. They are looking for something specific. Use bullets and bold font to highlight key facts (use high speed briefing techniques). Solid concise writing is essential. If used, photos should be high impact and tightly cropped. Use interactive graphics that require reader participation. All graphics must be relevant. Use the inverted pyramid. All information must relevant. One-sentence paragraphs may be used. Items for Internet publication should have half the word count of printed information. Use the message triangle: what happened, what is the impact, and what are we doing about it. The course will discuss how to provide a briefing to the media as efficiently as possible. They will discuss how to use hypertext and how to do sources and citations. Humor should be used with caution if at all. Avoid using promotional items.

Jim Noey gave an overview of developing a website using technology that already exists on many PCS. Word 2000 has a Wizard that steps you through the following process:

1. Select a title for the website. The title will appear at the top of the page and in the browser address.
2. Select location for storage. Enter or select the folder where the site will be developed.
3. Select the navigation technique for how the user will get around the website. Most sites today use a vertical frame.
4. Determine how many pages will be needed for the site. There are two thoughts on this: scroll through a few pages or divide the information into several pages.
5. Organize the pages. In the vertical frame, the pages will be listed on the left side of the screen.
6. Select the visual theme for the site. This determines what the site looks like. Word provides many possible themes.
7. Finish. This saves the selections made and creates and organizes the files.

In addition, the course covers how to save a Word document as an HTML file, how to get the site up to where the web will see it, file transfer protocol (FTP), and how to copy files to where they are needed.

NetMeeting is free. It allows 2 or more people to videoconference and can allow the others to access the files in your computer and modify them.

Chip Hultquist said that there are three areas covered in the course. A lot of companies are using NetMeeting. If a firewall is present it must be tunneled through to use NetMeeting. Inside a network, NetMeeting is easy to use. They (ORISE) have had 12 people connected at once. All could see the same document and could edit by transferring control of the document. It has a white board function that can be used for drawing and all will see what has been drawn. Mr. Hultquist noted that further information on the course and demonstrations of some of the techniques were set up in a separate conference room. In summary, the course provides training

in the use of current technology tools to enable public affairs personnel to create, share and display information on the Web.

First Session Q & A

Q: Terry Tallman, Morrow County, OR: What is the speed of the camera?
A: About 30 frames per second.

Q: Gary Epperson, Clark County, KY: Will this reduce travel?
A: This is for training. This last winter, Arkansas used it to put web pages up in minutes to give the latest information on the ice storms.

Second Session Q & A

Q: Bill Smith, Maryland EMA: Is the course designed for Public Affairs people or can anyone come?
A: The course is for Public Affairs personnel only, right now.

Q: Bill Smith: Who is providing funding for MS 2000?
A: Can not provide an answer; however, NetMeeting is a free download.

Q: Marianne Rutishauser, Tooele County, UT: What is being done to teach people how to access the web?
A: We are looking into developing a tool for use to gather information on specific topics much like the FBI now uses.

Presentation #2: Planning/Training/Exercises Crosswalk, Barry L. Shumpert, ORNL

The original Planning/Training/Exercises Crosswalk was disseminated in 1996. The Crosswalk is an attempt to assist the CSEPP community. The crosswalk lists a number of tasks that must be accomplished and the relationships among the emergency preparedness tasks and the CSEPP Planning Guidance and Guideline Reference, CSEPP Training Materials, and the CSEPP Exercise Objectives. This crosswalk includes all CSEPP-specific training materials and other relevant courses. The document has several appendixes. Appendix A lists the training courses for CSEPP; Appendix B is a cross reference between the Exercise Objectives and the Integrated Performance Evaluation (IPE) Performance Evaluation Guides (PEGs) and Response Streams; Appendix C has the acronyms and abbreviations.

Originally, the crosswalk was to be used to find holes in the training program. It is now used to show the interconnections of the program. It is intended for the crosswalk to list all training materials and how they relate to the program. It can be used to find needed training materials. Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) is working to incorporate IPE and performance measures indicators.

Q & A

Q: Audience: What reference package did the references come from?
A: The CSEPP Planning Guide.

Q: Ken Lerner, ANL: Where did the task list come from?
A: Bob Norville: An assessment of needs that ORNL expanded on for management and emergency responders up to the federal level. This can be downloaded from http://emc.ornl.gov. It is one of the 48,000 downloads that have been completed.

Presentation #3: Integrated Performance Evaluation (IPE) Process, Ron Barker (FEMA), John Gray (SBCCOM), and Jeff Shapiro (FEMA)

This has been a combined effort of Exercise and Training Officers (ETOs) and Exercise IPT members. They have been working on the IPE process for 3 years. The intent is to improve and refine the process after each exercise. Originally, there were 32 or 33 exercise objectives. They have been reduced to 15 objectives today. The IPE process consists of seven Response Streams. Many areas/actions in the response interrelate with other actions. The IPE Process was not developed independently.

As an example Response Stream 4, Protective Action Implementation (PAI), was looked at. The IPE Process Table of Contents has a definition of the stream and then a list of the PEGs. Within the IPE Performance Map there are Inputs and Conditions that use "A" for Army and "C" for off-post jurisdictions. Currently, "B" for a mix is not envisioned. There are indicators for where the action is performed at: "E" for EOC and "F" for field. There are also IPE Process Performance Maps for each stream that show where the actions will occur. The inputs that go into demonstrating the stream and conditions are also shown.

The PEG lists the element where the action will be demonstrated ("E" or "F"); expected outcomes; task; steps or things to look at; and references. The CSEPP Exercise Objectives had spaces for the evaluator to fill in observed data or action information. In the IPE process, the evaluator should observe what happens rather than fill out paperwork. There is a correlation of the old evaluation system to the new IPE process. The Training Crosswalk compares what is in the new IPE process to what is in the old evaluation system. The Crosswalk is an attempt to relate the PEGs to the current evaluation elements.

The FY2002 exercise schedule was shown in a slide presentation.

The Blue Book is being revised as part of the possible changes in the exercise program. The revised Blue Book will have an example of how to write an exercise extent of play agreement by response stream.

Jeff Shapiro, FEMA, provided some summary comments. He stated that initially he was not fully convinced of the value of this process. However, now he fully supports the effort. The result of using the process is a complete picture of what went on during an exercise versus the

previous method of looking at one thing at a time. His experience in using this process for the Pine Bluff exercises was that it discovered things that would have been missed under the old process. The IPE process reveals how jurisdictions interact/link with each other during an event.

Q & A

Q: Robert Sharp, ANL: Are all of the steps that are in the PEGs required to be performed?
A: John Gray: No, they are a memory jogger not a list of things to be done. Not all steps will be done by participants and some participants may do additional steps. The evaluators should note what is done. Did they follow their plan, did they do better than their plan, etc.? There is a desire to get away from the check-off approach and look at "did it work or not?" Ron Barker added that some steps may not apply to the situation.

Presentation #4: FY2002 Exercise Schedule, John Gray (SBCCOM)

The implementation for IPE is to begin on 1 January 2002. A lot has to be done to make this happen. The Blue Book must be completed and training materials must be completed for evaluators.

There are problems with the FY2002 exercise schedule. SBCCOM and FEMA do not want to direct the exercise dates, but the FY02 schedule is not good. There are 4 exercises in 43 days, 5 exercises in 64 days, and 6 exercises in 95 days. There are very few people that only support the CSEPP exercises. Those that have other duties will have a difficult time supporting the exercises and taking care of their regular job. The exercise evaluation team will be traveling from site to site. It is difficult for the evaluators to take care of their primary job. We may see evaluator team burnout. The exercise support contractor's team will be deployed for 57 straight days. The impact of the compressed schedule is overwhelming. This compressed exercise schedule affects the ability to train as well.

We want to have the best exercise program possible. Proposed solutions were shown on slides. One proposal did not fly. It proposed that possible exercise dates be published and the sites provide a list of "best" dates for the site exercise. It picked out good weeks with some flexibility to slide the dates to meet local needs. It had three weeks between exercises, did not have exercises during holiday weeks or immediately before holiday weeks. This listing was completed for the years through FY09. New options will be developed for presentation to the next State Directors Meeting. They will be offered three or four options. Please e-mail ideas to the IPT members.

First Session Q & A

Q: Jan Finegan, AMC: Why is there a compressed schedule in FY02?
A: Some sites must exercise in the school year to demonstrate certain response actions. Newport had to shift into the school year. There are various reasons for various sites. The REP exercises also impact on the CSEPP exercise schedule.

Q: Henry Hoffman, AMC: Was the 15-month cycle considered?
A: Yes, a key issue is extending the exercise schedule to 15 or 18 months or longer. Based upon feedback, of the 42 jurisdictions, more than half do not want an extended exercise cycle. They say that it is not good for the communities. They want to exercise as frequently as possible.

Q: Stan Thomas, Oregon OSHA: Who is the core evaluation team?
A: The core lead people are other CSEPPers. They have other jobs. They will need approximately 75 lead evaluator positions filled every year, not counting Army or Medical. Ron Barker said that one way to look at the core people is as SBCCOM CSEPPers, Field Surety Activity, and FEMA headquarters and regional staff. They are the key federal people. Many state and county people help each year. The regions frequently go to other regions to get help. There is a disk with a database of evaluators available.

Q: Landton Malone, FEMA Region III: What is written in stone for the exercise schedule? Can it really be implemented?
A: The compressed schedule will kill us. This year there were 5 evaluation methodologies in one cycle. We cannot do that again. The current schedule is going to be very difficult.

Q: Chris Dunham, BGCA: If some sites agree to go to a 15 or 18-month cycle could they do it?
A: All sites want a 12-month cycle. Gary Epperson and Judge Jack Jones agreed.

Comment: Henry Hoffman: We advocated a 15-month cycle to provide flexibility and the demonstration of response in all seasons for each site. But we can shift to different times for specific sites within the 12-month cycle. Judge Jack Jones commented that he would love to move from February. It was asked that John pass that idea to the State Directors.

Q: Deborah Wagner: Changing the schedule has an impact on the extent of play agreements. This has shortened the preparation cycle. Can they be provided a draft document for the development of the extent of play for the IPE process?
A: Yes.

Second Session Q & A

Q: Marc Madore: What is the target date for completing the exercise Blue Book?
A: We will be done by October then we'll try to get the PM managers to sign. We anticipate the document will be signed with no problems.

Q: Bill Smith: How soon will evaluation training be available?
A: SBCCOM will provide training. Several regions want training. We will come out and help you get geared-up.

Comment: Tim Bourdess of TRW made the comment that planning and work would have to start earlier to meet and properly support the 2002 exercise schedule.

Q: Bill Smith: We have a lot of work to do on the exercise extent of play so we need information on the process that is going to be used so when are we going to get it.
A: We will get the information to you as soon as we can.

Q: Jim Hackett, UMCD: Any chance to change the exercise schedule dates?
A: Yes, if someone will come forward and volunteer to change their dates. We have asked the state directors to step forward on changing some dates but there are no takers so far.

3.3 Public Outreach

This section combines the presentations and discussion from the two public outreach breakout sessions during the conference.

Presentation #1: Ready, Set, Act! (Kathy DeWeese, Aberdeen Proving Grounds PAO Maryland and Bill Bischof, Jefferson County, AR PIO)

You may have seen our display in the hallway or our Vision Statement on the walls. We are truly committed to people knowing what to do in an emergency. The Public Affairs IPT is comprised of representatives from four counties, two states, three FEMA representatives, and five Army people. We developed a charter (approved in February), meshed with a National Outreach Strategy, and put the emphasis on educating the community. We're looking outside of CSEPP to other industries to find out what's working elsewhere and build it into our strategy. We're working with the SIP working group to develop messages for the public and looking for other areas to integrate as well.

The IPT developed a Joint Communications Action Plan. This plan combines the resources of all eight sites for marketing, to ensure consistent tone and message and to share best practices. The Action Plan's strategy includes using people-centered messages; activating the active people (using their influence to influence others); establishing consistent message and tone; centralizing production/development and then spreading out the product; and measuring results by using baseline surveys.

The IPT's approach is to develop core products that can be used nationally with local customizing. This saves money over developing products from scratch at each site. Core products could include brochures, print ads, television and radio ad scripts, and other items. The philosophy is to "design nationally, tweak locally."

Another goal is to facilitate use of technology for public outreach, including tools such as Hotline and the CyberJIC. The Advanced JIC Course focuses on use of technology.

The IPT is a relationship-building opportunity; it encourages the exchange of information and ideas, which helps the program. Ideas don't just come from the IPT; they come from a variety of people at the sites and get fed into the IPT. Sites can implement the media campaign when they need it to happen and at the level they need. We also draw ideas from best practices throughout the chemical industry.

In the Ready, Set, Act! program, "Ready" is the mental part of the formula -- knowing how to respond because you've given it some thought. "Set" is making a plan and gathering the materials you need to fulfill that plan. The IPT has formed a subgroup to work on tools that will assist that process. "Act" is short for action. It isn't "go" because sheltering may be the appropriate action for some people. It is very important that we made that distinction.

Surveys are an important tool to measure the effectiveness of a public outreach program, and also to fulfill the requirements of the GPRA performance measurement process. We are developing a core set of questions that can be used at each site, with additional questions added locally to meet local needs.

Our vision is a public that can and will act appropriately upon notification of an emergency at a chemical installation.

Presentation #2: CSEPP Pilot Project – Umatilla Media Campaign (Tom Worden, Oregon State Police, Mark E. Clemens, State of Washington, Meg Capps, Umatilla County, Oregon, Cheryl Humphrey, Umatilla County)

This has been a team project. The goal was to improve public readiness. If the public doesn't know what to do, it doesn't matter how great our EOC looks. We coordinate marketing by meshing advertising with outreach efforts – events, meeting people, spreading the word. FEMA and the Army supported this. It was necessary to evaluate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of this program.

Team approach – Different team members had experience with different media. The team determined themes and messages. We saved money by designing radio and print ads in-house. We didn't have TV production expertise. We solicited bids from production companies. We worked very intimately with them to produce the spots we wanted. We didn't just turn over information to them and let them produce it. We ran a total of 13 TV spots in two phases – nine spots in the fall then four spots in spring.

Investment & Media Buys – The basic buy was for radio – we could reach a lot of people and it is cheaper than TV. Prime time TV buys are more expensive but reach lots of people. We stuck to prime time -- more bang for the buck. We made buys every six months and could make changes as needed. We used the Arbitron report (radio ratings) to choose demographics to target and the media to use to get to those demographic groups. The operative term is "optimum effective scheduling." We used newspaper ads to embellish the messages and promote the website and phone numbers.

Bi-lingual Buys – There are four Hispanic radio stations in our market; we used all four to reach the population. The survey showed an increase in knowledge in this demographic. "Ready Week" (the week before the exercise) draws attention to CSEPP. This year we changed the name from Awareness Week to Ready Week to start going towards the Ready, Set, Act! theme. We ran lots of extra ads at this time. The survey found that women were less informed about readiness

than men – so we focused on women. This shows the value of a survey – we could alter the ads to suit a different demographic and plug a hole picked up in the survey.

Evaluation - Telephone Surveys – We conducted telephone surveys every three months. We got 800 responses per survey including people from both states. That equals 3200 people for the four surveys. In all, we reached 10 percent of the IRZ/PAZ population. The survey included 17 questions on preparedness and 5 demographic questions (men/women, age group, address, etc.). The survey focused on public preparedness knowledge not on depot knowledge.

The survey results were a surprise with respect to protective actions for schools. We've over-pressurized 11 of 23 schools; they have plans in place. We thought the public knew about it. We found they didn't. We asked, "How confident are you in the school's ability to protect your child?" Twenty-nine percent agreed. We shifted emphasis in advertising and in outreach efforts through the schools. We found out the teachers were scared the parents were going to storm the schools.

Evaluation - Website and Phone Calls – We had 75,253 Internet page hits and 638 phone calls. That's up more than two times. TV ads were driving phone calls; print ads and radio drove Internet activity. We got more calls from people in Oregon than Washington. One hundred percent of the Benton County calls were from outside of emergency zones. People in the Tri-cities area got messages through TV and wanted to know more. It was a secondary goal of ours to educate these people.

Evaluation - Outreach Activities – We did a breakdown by categories for presentations (business, school, Hispanic, etc.) Prior to the ad campaign we did 60 events. We saw a 30 percent increase in requests for presentations – particularly schools and businesses. They wanted to adapt existing emergency plans for a chemical emergency. This information can be used for other chemical accidents – not just CSEPP. The concepts are the same. The media campaign will generate more work for you because people will have questions. You'll have to mail information, answer questions, do more presentations and website maintenance.

We had our annual awareness campaign right before exercise. We wanted the public to be thinking about "What if?" "What do we need to do?" We asked them to practice at the same time we were having our exercise. We worked about 21 days in a row right before the exercise. It took all of our jurisdictions to pull this off. We were preparing for the exercise and working events non-stop. We, as a group, said we wanted to do more, but it took a toll on us as well. The public needs to know. We wanted to hit all of our target groups. We didn't want to tell them to come to us, so we went to them. We found the people and went to them. Keep it simple – be sure to target well and hit as many people as you can at each event.

Lessons learned – We had a number of lessons learned. A team approach is the key. Research your community first – learn about media ratings, census, minority needs. This helps you develop your target audience and messages. Timeliness and readiness were the key messages for us, but we had to begin by building trust. Because of the false siren activation (in December 1999), we had to build up a lot of support. The campaign was set to start right then. We held off

to refocus and to avoid the appearance of a cover-up. We had to start from where the public was -- they didn't trust us. The marketing plan combined advertising and outreach – you must combine both. In dealing with the media, everything is negotiable. We got about 1/3 of our radio ads free. We asked for a break and we got it. Production takes a lot of time – even if you hire an agency. Use everything to evaluate – web hits, public reaction to ads, decision maker input, casual contact. Brief everyone beforehand and keep them updated on progress. We've provided each site with a CD that has more lessons learned along with plans, radio spots, TV spots, newspaper spots; all survey results and questions, and a final report.

First Session Q & A

Q: A USDA representative asked how the campaign addressed food safety?
A: Mr. Clemens said it wasn't addressed in the Umatilla campaign because it is not part of the information that the public needs to know ahead of time. Mrs. Humphrey said they had two protective strategies to teach people - SIP and evacuate. They had to start with basics.

Q: Don Jacks, FEMA: Were people mad you were spending money on this?
A: Mr. Clemens Completely the opposite. This is something (information) that the public wants and needs.

Q: Mr. Jacks: what about those stations you didn't buy from?
A: Mr. Worden: we bought from 6 radio stations and four TV -- that's about all of them. Meg Capps we went for an optimum effective schedule – not a shotgun effect. There's a formula behind that. Stations can tell you how many ads you need to run to reach the people you need to reach. Mrs. Humphrey remember the environment at the beginning. We never got into the issue of, "Is this (incineration) the right thing to do?" It doesn't matter – there's a potential for an accident, what can you do to be ready? That was the focus and people like it.

Q: Steve Horwitz: Did you have any mid-course corrections?
A: Mr. Worden: Yes, about over pressurized schools. The message was kids are safer at school. But parents' reaction was to go get the kids. This increases risk for parents while driving and endangers students if a parent insisted on breaking into the school. We educated parents about how safe things were at the school. We saw those numbers (understanding, comprehension and agreement) increase steadily. Mrs. Humphrey – we combined outreach with that ad. We went to the schools. Schools had concerns that parents would show up. We worked with teachers to get that message out during parent teacher conferences. We did a print ad with two principals. Schools sent information home with kids.

Q: Gen. Alexander: That must have been your greatest challenge to overcome parent resistance.
A: Mrs. Humphrey: It's ongoing. Media campaigns are never ending. People move in and out of an area so there's always a maintenance mode. Once we identified gaps, we used TV to catch their attention then radio and print hammered it in. Outreach tied it all together. Mr. Worden – there will always be some people who don't know what to do. We can't reach 100 percent, but we continue to try every day. If you cycle through an audience every day, something catches on eventually. Mr. Clemens – There's still room for improvement. Mrs. Humphrey – Our next focus

is business, SIP for business. We've got the consistent message out there for SIP. There's a sample for how to talk to businesses and a plan from West Virginia. I use that plan to start from and build from there.

First Session Discussion:

Steve Horwitz: Another big challenge is that the default protective action is different for Washington and Oregon. They addressed this head on. They covered both states at that point.
Mrs. Humphrey: Teaching people to stay put is difficult – it's our flight or fight instinct. Mrs. Capps – We've engaged principals and teachers to speak the language for us. But they're the faces/people the public know now and trusts. We're putting letters into the packets for the kids that go home to talk about that.

Mr. Worden: Budget figures are set to coincide with the startup of the incinerator. We must be consistent with the message every day. Everyone in the program needs to have the same message.

Mr. Horwitz: Funding is not a done deal, but we're on the right track. Higher headquarters are supporting this.

John Yaquiant introduced Alan J. Williams from the Maryland Department of the Environment. Mr. Williams was one of the lead spokespersons during the Baltimore train derailment. Mr. Williams said his vision is the same vision as CSEPP's. We didn't have any chemical installations. We had public facilities to protect and educate and we had educated with SIP kits, etc. But that information had never gotten out of south Baltimore where those stationary facilities are. We learned we needed to educate a much larger area because a train is just like a chemical installation in the danger that it presents.

Second Session Q & A

Q: Steve Horwitz: You used newspapers to reinforce core themes with bold statements, didn't you?
A: Mrs. Humphrey: One message was "Minutes matter." People were asking how long they had to take action. With this theme, we could also show what you do now to prepare can help you.
Mr. Clemens: Print ads started very heavy with text. We thought we'd tell them "everything they need to know" there. We learned that we had to catch their attention with these ads. So we used headlines like "minutes matter." Then we directed them to websites, phone numbers, etc. for further information.

Q: (audience) How did you incorporate the demil and outreach folks?
A: Jim Hackett: We used a team approach. We have CSEPP staff plus the PMCD folks and the depot folks. It is good because the public doesn't see the difference between the different parts of the Army. We used the Outreach Office to review scripts – people go to the Outreach Office if they have questions, so we thought it was key to include them.

Q: Erma Wilkins, chairwoman of the Anniston CAC: How do we do this in AL?
A: Mr. Clemens: Sit down and talk. (A discussion followed on options for a public education campaign and how to deal with a situation where one jurisdiction does not agree with the others on some aspects of the program.)

3.4 Performance Measures

This section combines the presentations and discussion from the two performance measures breakout sessions during the conference.

Presentation #1: CSEPP Planners Website (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ and Gary Scronce, IEM Inc.)

Mr. Herring introduced the site and described its development. The planners website was developed quickly following the December planning meeting in Dallas: a prototype was up by February, and the final was launched in April of this year. The site enables CSEPP program staff to access reference documents and share site-developed documents and best practices. To upload to the site, just follow the directions given when you log on. There are about 150 registered users so far. Some pages are public and some are private, CSEPP-Community only (i.e. available only to registered users).

Mr. Scronce then did a live demonstration of the site, including how to register for access to the private part, links to other sites, and available resources. Plans and sections of plans are available for download. Information is also available on other types of resources, contacts, workgroups (including membership and meeting minutes), CSEPP in the News (updated daily), and meeting and conference dates. Users can upload information directly or they can mail hard copy in to the webmaster and it will be scanned and posted.

There is a new prototype medical page for sharing resources, best practices, meeting minutes, etc. but it is not yet finalized. Contacts can be searched by name or organization – please input your information if you have not already.

First Session Q & A

Q: (audience) How do we get to the Community portion of the website?
A: Gary Scronce: Register at the public portion of the website and after approval, you will be given access. The site is designed to link to other CSEPP websites and has meeting minutes stored as portable document format (pdf) files. The system stores site specific information to be shared with the overall planning community. For example, the site will have MOUs and MOAs and electronic copies of plans. The system has a "contact" database by name, site, or function for all registered users. The system can also have links to recent newspaper articles pertaining to CSEPP.

Q: (audience) Are exercise reports on the site?
A: Gary Scronce: They should be posted soon.

Q: Douglas Becvar of FEMA Region VIII: What are the potential legal concerns for this website?
A: Gary Scronce: All information on the website is listed as "for information only."

Q: Robert Stanley, Indiana: What will keep the system from overloading?
A: Gary Scronce: The system administrator will QC all requests for access to the Community portion of the website. System knowledge and official lists do this. If a person requesting access cannot be determined in on of these ways, Joe Herring or Dennis Legel will be contacted.

Q: John Bastin, Kentucky: We are rebuilding the Kentucky website, should we link to this site?
A: Gary Scronce: Yes, we would encourage you to do so.

Second Session Q & A

Q: Larry Keen, FEMA Region X: Why are there three different CSEPP websites?
A: We will work on consolidating them now that the planners site is up.

Q: Larry Keen, FEMA Region X: Some of us have firewalls that prevent receiving large files – how can we download documents?
A: If you have a problem with that let the webmaster know, we can always send a hard copy or electronic copy by mail.

Comment: Don Broughton, Madison County, KY: Note that from this site you can get a full set of the CSEPP policy papers, and the latest version of the planning guidance. It would be nice to get automatic notification whenever there is a new policy document issued, similar to the automatic system for notification of weather warnings.

Presentation #2: Performance Measures (Joe Herring, FEMA HQ, Doug Becvar, FEMA Region VIII, Allen Kniphfer, Jefferson County, AL; Robert Stevens of FEMA HQ [first session only] and Mr. Mike Boechler of IEM, Inc.)

Mr. Herring led off the presentation on performance measures. Performance measures are required by GPRA. FEMA's system for the CSEP Program is undergoing a trial implementation this quarter, with full implementation in the first quarter of FY 2002. We are beta testing the Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) software now. Program discs and instructions will be available soon.

Other recent planning workgroup agenda items include definition of "non-surety," regional structured interviews for planning baselines, and analysis tools such as the sync matrix and the IEM systems analysis tool.

Mr. Becvar gave detailed information on the performance measure system. IEM was tasked to develop performance indicators for the program. The goal was to develop a complete and coordinated Performance Measures Plan. The process entailed reviewing all known relevant

reference documents then providing a crosswalk of those documents. A panel of CSEPP executives agreed on four primary performance measures: Alert and Notification, Public Outreach, Coordinated Plans, and Communication Systems. The Planning Workgroup was tasked to define "complete and coordinated" plans for the planning performance measure (CP-1). The Workgroup used many references, including the CSEPP Planning Guidance, the Exercise Blue Book Appendix C, and local CARs. A meeting in Little Rock identified 170 elements from the references. A computer based system was developed for tracking the elements and performance measures. The computer system was alpha tested in Parke County, IN and Utah has volunteered for a beta test. Based on testing to date, the workgroup recommended to FEMA:

- CP-1 applies to IRZ, PAZ, and host counties as well as CSEPP states.
- A 15-item list be completed by August 31, 2001.
- The checklist should be automated for ease of use.
- Phase in the 170-item list over four years.

Members of the workgroup can provide technical assistance. There is a representative of each site (except Bluegrass) on the workgroup.

The CP-1 checklist of 15 items should be evaluated with respect to completed plans only (not future capabilities). The items are weighted by importance.

Mr. Kniphfer spoke on Jefferson County's CAR experience. The County EMA did a self assessment, then hired ER Institute to do an external review. The results were that the EMA has 176 end products. The County EMA developed plans, procedures, a training plan, an EOC operations manual, and a strategic plan for future improvements. This process resulted in an agency turnaround and increased political support, funding, staffing, and effectiveness. Recommend using the CAR as a tool for program improvement.

Mr. Robert Stevens of FEMA HQ spoke on "What is the Capability Assessment Readiness (CAR) process?" The CAR process is designed to collect, analyze, track, and report quantitative data on capabilities for response. The system requires standardization, creates an opportunity for dialogue, and is useful for strategic planning and the budget process.

The process started with a prototype state CAR developed by FEMA and the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA). Then a local prototype was developed. The CAR is related to National Fire Protection Association standard NFPA-1600 and to NEMA accreditation. The CAR process is broken down into four sub-processes: structure, methodology, technology, and benefits. A brief description of each sub-process was given.

The CSEPP performance measure system has a hierarchical level of detail, with 13 Emergency Management Functions (EMFs), 79 Attributes, 170 Characteristics, and about 500 sub-items. The computerized version will be available soon. To use it, you rate your program on a scale of 1 to 5 on each attribute, and the program computes a weighted average rating for each EMF. Mr. Boechler demonstrated the system and various reports that it can generate.

First Session Q & A

Q: Charles Scott, Kentucky: Where was the system tested?
A: Joe Herring: Three states – Maryland, Kentucky, and Alabama; field-testing continues.

Q: David Holm, Colorado OEM: How do we deal with the psychology of being honest in the self-evaluation?
A: Joe Herring: The tool relies on the honesty and professionalism of the individual that is ultimately responsible for the self-evaluation.

Q: George Krock, Maryland EMA: In testing the system, it took almost a year reviewing and analyzing the data. How can quarterly reporting be effective and workable?
A: Joe Herring: The entire system does not have to be worked for the quarterly reports. Only the 15 items need to be analyzed, not all of the attributes. Robert Stevens reiterated that the 15 items would be sufficient at this time.

Q: Deroy Holt, FEMA Region VIII: Why not use all 170 attributes right away?
A: Joe Herring: 170 attributes would be too much for a system just beginning. Too much time would be spent doing the report instead of using the report to analyze soft spots in the system.

Q: Charles Scott: Who supplies the answers for the CARs?
A: Joe Herring: It should be a collaborative effort within the given community using senior staff.

Q: Stanley Ross, Oregon State Police: What constitutes the local authority?
A: Joe Herring: The local authority is the person who is responsible for filing the report.

Second Session Q & A

Q: Dave Smith, Illinois: Will the CAR go to the states for distribution to the counties?
A: Yes.

Q: Terry Mann, FEMA Region IV: Can you change the weighting to fit your local priorities?
A: Currently no.

Q: Dave Smith, Illinois: We developed a local CAR on our own for Illinois last year. How can we reconcile it with the CSEPP CAR and future local CARs from FEMA?
A: Our system is optional. You can use your own system if you prefer.

Q: Charles Williams, Alabama: How does the Army tie in to this?
A: It doesn't – this is a FEMA process. But the installation should cooperate as much as possible.

Q: Don Miller, Washington: The ratings are good but is there a way to put textual explanations into the system?
A: Yes, there is a Notes function for text.

3.5 Medical

Four breakout sessions were held on medical issues. Each medical breakout session addressed different topics and had different presentations; therefore they are summarized separately below.

First Session (Wednesday, July 25 at 1:00 P.M.)

Presentation #1: Case Study, Georgia Hazmat Incident (Dr. Robert Geller, Georgia Poison Center)

Dr. Geller gave a presentation about hospitals' state of preparedness for chemical emergencies and how they can improve their capabilities and plans to deal with disaster situations. He illustrated his point by discussing the effects of several disaster incidents. The incidents discussed included: the impact on a hospital's operations of treating a single individual who had intentionally ingested organophosphate; response preparation for the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta; unanticipated patient levels at hospitals following the Oklahoma City bombing disaster; the Tokyo sarin incident; a large scale salmonella poisoning in Oregon; and the Washington DC (B'nai Brith) anthrax hoax.

Specific findings that were observed included: cross contamination that affected the emergency department and staff, other patients, and the disruption to the hospital routine; varied decontamination response capabilities; lack of notification time to the hospitals that an incident had occurred because most people were "walk-ins" and were not transported by the EMS system; the impact of off-gassing; providing treatment before completing chemical identification; the availability of antidote; and the ability to detect unusual diseases without specific warning.

Dr. Geller stressed the need for hospitals to conduct a reality-based assessment of their capabilities, to plan for the worst case scenario, to test their plans and to make improvements based on the results of exercises. He then outlined the criteria and considerations for stocking of different antidotes needed to deal with a variety of chemicals. He suggested minimum hourly levels that should be stocked based on availability from sources within or outside the hospital's region. Hospitals need to assess their response capabilities to include the pre-hospital environment and be prepared to deal with perceived obstacles such as cost, space, and lack of local interest. Areas to be addressed in an assessment include expectations of responders, staff attitudes-interest, physical plant preparedness, how to handle mass casualties, and the risk to the hospital from contaminated patients. Dr. Geller discussed the operation of the Georgia Poison Center and stressed the need for all planners to include the Poison Centers in their planning process.

Q & A

Q: (audience) Where cholinesterase levels found to be depressed?
A: No. There was no baseline data for comparison.

Q: Lloyd Baker, Utah Dept. of Health: I was surprised that you included the possible use of British Anti-Lewisite as an antidote for mustard.
A: The slide should have reflected vesicants or more specifically, Lewisite. Dr. McIntosh commented that experimental data suggests it may work.

Comment: Jim Cody, Pueblo, CO: It is important to include the medical examiners office in your CSEPP planning. We should continue to move forward with the all-hazards approach with our non-stockpile issues as well as our stockpile.

Presentation #2: Casualty Planning: Consider All Your Medical Considerations (Critical Incident Preparedness) (Richard Lipich and James Kramer, Colorado)

Mr. Lipich stated that the goal of the presentation was to point out the need for response personnel in any disaster incident to properly care for the dead while assuring the safety of survivors and responders. While stating it was not the intent to imply that multiple fatalities are likely to occur in a CSEPP incident, fatalities could occur and that the community must be prepared to deal with that possibility. Mr. Kramer stated that training should be given to emergency responders (law enforcement, EMS, planners, fire/rescue personnel, emergency management personnel, and other disaster workers) on the role of the Medical Examiner's Office in any emergency. He stressed the need to get all the emergency response players together early to build trust and to work together. Further, he mentioned that CSEPP training supports the all hazards concept of emergency response being advocated in many emergency management organizations.

Mr. Kramer highlighted how a mass casualty incident can expand from a local to a national level response. He pointed out areas of public policy concerns and potential conflicts in dealing with a mass casualty situations. These include the issue of who is in charge when dealing with local, State and national level organizations; religious concerns; sensitivity to the needs of the surviving family members; organizational leadership roles; and communicating to a variety of people and organizations. He then discussed the specific roles and responsibilities of the Medical Examiners/Coroners Office and the services they must provide. He suggested annual reassessments of the hospital's capability. Mr. Kramer concluded his presentation by re-emphasizing the key objectives of being prepared, communicating and coordinating, resource identification, and training and exercising.

Q & A

Q: (audience) What is the response time for a mortuary team?
A: Response is guaranteed within 24 hours.

Q: (audience) Do you have an MOU/MOA that established authority over the deceased?
A: In Colorado the jurisdiction is established by place of death.

Second Medical Session (Wednesday, July 25 at 3:00 P.M.)

Presentation #1: Care of Psychogenic Patients (Dr. Dickson Diamond, National Domestic Preparedness Office)

Dr. Diamond briefed on the development of the National Domestic Preparedness Office and the possible changes in that organization which is charged with addressing the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) against the United States. He described his observations of two national level exercises: the 1999 terrorism exercise "Westwind", and the 2000 exercise TOPOFF. He concluded that these exercises highlighted the need to include mental health professionals as members of the response teams to address the psychological concerns of the first responders, victims and the general public. In addition, he suggested that exercises should be designed to conduct an in-depth test of the capabilities of the mental health professionals.

Dr. Diamond then compared a WMD event and an attack using conventional weapons from the standpoint of the psychological impact of the "unknowns" in the situation. As an example, in reviewing the 1997 B'nai Brith anthrax hoax in Washington DC, he concluded that the way an incident is handled can cause more damage than the actual threat. He then discussed the 1995 Tokyo subway sarin attack, citing the many psychological effects on the community that must be properly handled by mental health care professionals. These include paranoia, aggravation of pre-existing psychiatric conditions, panic, evacuation, quarantine, looting, and fatalities. Further, he mentioned the impact on the community infrastructure and the concerns that can be generated by hospitals.

Dr. Diamond also addressed some of the long-term psychological effects that can occur and may require assistance from mental health care professionals. He stressed that plans need to consider the mental health of responders, hospital workers, patients, and the general population. He concluded his presentation by stating that while you can't prevent an attack or physical casualties, you can mitigate the number of psychological casualties, which is potentially the largest group of affected individuals.

Presentation #2: Care of Psychogenic Patients (Colonel (Dr.) Ann Norwood, Medical Corps, US Army, Department of Psychiatry, Uniformed Services University)

Dr. Norwood provided a briefing that addressed the psychological and behavioral consequences of a chemical release and the need to integrate disaster mental health experts in the planning and response process. She indicated that psychological and behavioral responses might overwhelm the medical system in the early stages of an incident and cause other effects in the later stages. Further, she advocates the all-hazard s approach to planning and response and the need to share information.

Dr. Norwood used statistics from four historic events involving actual or threatened chemical weapons or hazardous material B a WWI gas attack, the Scud missile attacks on Israel, a New Zealand hazmat incident, and the Bhopal, India gas plant disaster B to illustrate the magnitude of the psychological impact of a disaster situation. The information showed that in each instance, psychologically affected patients represented the largest percentage of patients

seen following the incident. She discussed the behavior that could occur during a mass panic situation, but cited instances that show mass panic does not always occur. She then discussed fear producing aspects of chemical agents and the signs and symptoms of anxiety.

Another case study discussed was the radioactive-release incident that occurred in Goiania, Brazil in 1987. People scavenging metal from a defunct medical clinic unknowingly released radioactive cesium from a piece of medical equipment. The incident description showed the impact on the response system, the importance of the media, and the economic and social consequences affecting the city.

Dr. Norwood then discussed some post-event intervention actions that should be taken to minimize psychological impact of the situation. Lastly she presented a series of recommendations regarding public education, risk communications and the role of the media. She concluded her presentation by stressing the importance of realistic training and exercises.

Third Medical Session (Thursday, July 26 at 8:00 AM)

Presentation #1: JCAHO Hospital Standards for 2001 (John Fishbeck, JCAHO)

Mr. Fishbeck first provided background on the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO). He defined the mission of this independent not-for-profit organization as "to continuously improve the safety and quality of care provided to the public through the provision of health care accreditation and related services that support performance improvements in health care organizations." He went on to describe how they accomplish their mission, the number and types of health care organizations that have been accredited (over 19,000), the benefits of accreditation, the importance of standards, and their survey process. He discussed the seven Environment of Care Standards and the associated management cycle of plan, teach, implement, measure/assess, improve, and plan.

Mr. Fishbeck then reviewed the new JCAHO standards for Emergency Management that became effective January 1, 2001. The old standards titled "Emergency Preparedness" (Environmental Care 1.4) focused on inflexible static plans that were generally created in a vacuum, and addressed major trauma events. Under the revised standards titled "Emergency Management" the new focus requires a dynamic and flexible system that is integrated with the community and addresses on-going emergencies. He reviewed the specifics of each of the revised emergency management standards. They include: conducting a hazard vulnerability analysis, establishing plan activation criteria, integrating the organization's role with the community wide response, managing six specified activities during an emergency, preparing for patient, staff and family needs, having an orientation and training program, conducting regular drills and exercises, and conducting an annual evaluation of the emergency management plan.

Mr. Fishbeck concluded his presentation by discussing the contract awarded to SAIC to improve direction and response to bioterrorism events.

Q & A

Q: Is there a need for an Incident Command Structure under the new standards?
A: No. However, you need to make sure your plan is coordinated with the community.

Q: Can an alternate care facility be anywhere?
A: Yes, it can be a school or similar structure.

Q: Are runners an acceptable alternate communication system?
A: The Standards have that flexibility.

Q: How are the risks of the hazards determined? Do you know in advance based on your knowledge of the community or do you rely on each hospital for that determination?
A: By the combined knowledge of the surveyors and the organization itself. They will survey one community at a time.

Presentation #2: Integrating the New JCAHO Standards Into the Hospital Planning Process (Debbie Kim, Director, Emergency Management and Hazardous Material Program, University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics)

Ms. Kim discussed the background of the new standards and her involvement as a panel member as the standards were developed. The standards became effective January 1, 2001. They created significant changes for the hospital community by emphasizing emergency management (with its four phases) vs. emergency preparedness as a concept, the need to conduct a vulnerability analysis, and the need for community interoperability. She also mentioned the effect on reimbursement and the problems facing hospitals without reimbursement. Ms. Kim then discussed some of the specific things they identified as they conducted their hazard vulnerability analysis. She cited things that took place in the 2001 Houston, Texas flood, the August 1999 Salt Lake City tornado and preparations for the upcoming Olympics to highlight the all-hazards approach to emergency planning.

Ms. Kim then emphasized the need for change in hospital emergency programs. There are extensive regulations and OSHA and JCAHO have major roles. Non-compliance can be very expensive. On the other hand active planning places the hospital in a positive light as a pro-active team player. She then outlined the major things that have worked for the emergency management program at the University of Utah hospital and clinics during the last year. These include: an incident command system, a revision of Department status report forms, revisions of hazardous material working forms, a revisiting of the hazard vulnerability analysis and finally integrating plans with several programs, including the Olympics. She mentioned that doctors have participated in the hazmat training, which has been integrated with the city fire department's hazmat training.

Ms. Kim then discussed the lessons learned from CSEPP, including working closely with local and state officials. Lastly she listed specific points they use to evaluate CSEPP/hazmat preparedness, including review hazardous material operations and respiratory protection plans, notification procedures, personnel call-in, and tracking of patient data.

Presentation #3: The JCAHO Emergency Management Survey (Dennis Hudson, Emergency Services, Jefferson Regional Medical Center, Pine Bluff, Arkansas)

Mr. Hudson stressed the importance of JCAHO certification as a means to obtain reimbursement for the hospitals involved in a disaster situation and to participate in other activities such as HMOs. He then discussed the efforts they took to prepare for their upcoming JCAHO emergency management survey (evaluation). Mr. Hudson stated that they were better prepared to address the new standards because they had a CSEPP plan in place. He then discussed the contents of the new standards and the four major improvements he believes they made. Specifically, he mentioned the adoption of a four stage approach (mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery), standardized nomenclature, the interaction with NFPA 1600 which is more detailed and helpful to the process, and the integration of health care with the community incident command structure.

Mr. Hudson explained the five major steps they used to improve their plan: analyze the elements, crosswalk the plan, construct the new plan, teach the plan and exercise the plan. In evaluating the existing plan they did an analysis of all elements and looked for gaps with the new standards. They assigned each element a probability and severity that gave them a starting point so standard operating procedures could be developed.

He then used the flooding of Houston, Texas as an example of the impact an event can have on a community. Jefferson Regional Medical Center was called upon to provide support. Mr. Hudson mentioned that a hospital command and control structure is critical and that it is important that the subject of who is in charge be settled in advance. He mentioned that they use the Hospital Emergency Incident Command System in their plan as the way to do business. He concluded his presentation by stating that once the plan has been developed it must be taught in a variety of ways and it is also important to exercise the plan in a variety of ways. Drills and exercises are addressed in the standards. Use of table-top and paper drills can save money.

Q & A

Q: Mike Parette: How extensive does the drill have to be to qualify?
A: It should stress the organization and test all the major elements of the plan.

Q: Dr. Alcorta: Who did you call in during the vulnerability analysis?
A: Dennis Hudson: We used the SARA III plan to identify other problems.

Q: How did you administer use of the IC system?
A: Debbie Kim: The new CEO knew the system and felt comfortable with its use.
A: Dennis Hudson: We trained the people with roles on their need to let the Incident Commander make the decisions.

Fourth Medical Session (Thursday, July 26 at 9:45 AM)

Presentation: Integrating CSEPP Planning (Panel of Utah officials consisting of Lloyd Baker, State Health Department; Paula Ernstrom, State Comprehensive Emergency Management; Barbara Crouch, Poison Control Center; Kari Sager, Tooele County Emergency Management; Spencer Cannon, Utah County Sheriff's Office; Brad Morell, Salt Lake City Fire Department; and Debbie Kim, University of Utah Health Sciences Center)

Mike Proctor of SAIC moderated the panel session. He stated the purpose of the session was to discuss how integrated planning was accomplished in Utah. He asked the panel members to give a short synopsis on their responsibilities, the obstacles they encountered, and the way they overcame those obstacles.

Mr. Baker indicated the Health Department job was to be sure they were ready from the standpoint of equipment and training to deal with any possible off-site release. Further, he explained that it took time to overcome the obstacles but in time the organizations realized that they must work together to get the job done.

Ms. Ernstrom stated that her job as the State PIO is to try to build trust with other PIOS at all levels. She indicated she relies on the JIC/JIS system in emergencies.

Ms. Crouch pointed out the Poison Control Center is staffed 24-hours and seven days a week. They know the capabilities of all the hospitals in the state. Further, they adopted the all-hazards approach to emergency situations and can help provide the public and emergency responders valuable information that will help deal with a chemical emergency situation.

Ms. Sager views her job as one of putting all resources together to address the situation. She helps get this done by understanding the roles and capabilities of the organizations, setting up a chain of command, and looking to see if all parts fit. Ms. Sager believes the best approach to a successful operation is to cooperate and coordinate.

Mr. Cannon indicated that part of his job is to coordinate with other counties on training and to help establish and maintain TCPs needed in support of an emergency situation. He indicated one of his current challenges is dealing with a population that is expanding from 300 to 3500.

Mr. Morell indicated his primary responsibility is to work with responders and to see that they are trained on use of equipment and the response plan. He indicated that CSEPP has helped them prepare for the upcoming Olympics by bringing organizations together to be sure plans will work.

Ms. Kim indicated that her primary role is to take care of patients. She relies on other functional areas to provide information so she can have things ready to handle different situations.

Following the opening comments from the panel members, Mr. Proctor and others posed a series of questions for the panel to address.

Q: How did the integration process start?

A: Lloyd Baker: It took time to get over personal opinions and attitudes. Over time we changed attitudes to open the door during meetings so they can work together.
A: Spencer Cannon: We realized that we are tied to a common goal. We tried get the group in a win-win framework. Get to know other persons and allow others some flexibility.
A: Paula Ernstrom: Through an understanding that each individual brings strengths to the table and that the group should do better because of that. The CSEPP JIC concept works and they are using it to build the Olympic response. They have representatives from all agencies in JIC.
A: Spencer Cannon: I am new to the system. The original problems to working together no longer exist.
A: Barbara Crouch: It works well to be assertive about the capabilities of the agencies so others will know what you can do to help the team.
A: Debbie Kim: You need the ability to communicate with each other. We have grown as we learned from the ground up. CSEPP helped develop hospital capability.
A: Brad Morell: I am a late arrival and am helping to maintain involvement. I am trying to learn what the job and requirements are and will take ownership for my part of the process. We should remember that we all work for the citizens of the community and decisions should be based on that responsibility. It is most critical to get to know the team members and to work the all hazard approach. Know who to call for help. The team gets together informally on occasion to get to know each other better.
A: Kari Sager: We looked at the materials and tools that are available to help do the job. Know the other person's capability and let them do the job. Train dispatchers to know who can help solve problems and call on them for assistance.

Q: Is there a police - fire conflict?

A: There was but we are getting together to share resources. We train together to break down the barriers . We are also cross training our skills.
A: Brad Morell: We interact hundreds of times. We all know each other, have developed friendships, and have a common goal. For example, we exchanged knowledge by putting paramedics in the ER to learn the others job.

Q: Larry Skelly: How do you use the exercise program?

A: Spencer Cannon: The likelihood of a CSEPP incident is low. However, we train and exercise the way it might happen. I would like to see us be able to use the real world media in the exercises. Also, what about treating fatalities?
A: Debbie Kim: We need to prepare for the possibility of fatalities.
A: Kari Sager: We know fatalities will occur from some source - heart, accident, etc. and should address that fact.

Mr. Don Jacks of FEMA outlined the case for using mock media in exercises. A discussion followed that outlined the pro and cons of using the real media in lieu of the mock media during CSEPP exercises.
Q: Do you feel that you are prepared to respond?

A: Spencer Cannon: Yes, but things will be confused initially.
A: Brad Morell: We are better prepared because of Atlanta and what we have learned from other situations.
A: Paula Ernstrom: We have learned from other incidents.
A: Debbie Kim: She discussed their preparation for the upcoming Olympics.

There was also a brief discussion on the need for intelligence information. The session concluded with the agreement that as public servants, it is essential that all of the response organizations become involved in an integrated planning effort.

3.6 Program Close-Out / End of CSEPP

Presentation: Army's Position on the Closeout of CSEPP (Mr. Denzel Fisher, OASA(ESOH))

Copies of a July 20, 2001 letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety and Occupational Health to the Director of FEMA were given to everyone in the audience. Mr. Fisher explained the contents of the Army policy on termination of CSEPP assistance to state and local governments. The Army policy is based on Section 141 of Public Law 105-261 (the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999). The statute expressly prohibits the Army or FEMA from providing any assistance to state and local governments after the completion of the destruction of the United States' stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions. Accordingly, the Army will not request funding for a CSEPP state in the fiscal year following the completion of the destruction of the stockpile affecting that state.

Q & A

Q: Kari Sager, Tooele County Emergency Management: Will there be some transition in the Army between CSEPP and the non-stockpile program? There needs to be a dialogue on this issue.
A: D. Fisher: Legally we cannot deal with non-stockpile under CSEPP. The Army has an obligation to deal with the non-stockpile, but it will have to be done outside of CSEPP. I agree that a dialogue is needed.

Q: Dennis Rockwell, Tooele County Emergency Management: What will happen to the non-stockpile when the demilitarization plant is shut down?
A: D. Fisher: The demilitarization plant will be used to destroy the non-stockpile and destruction should be completed before the plant is closed. Don't know what will happen if non-stockpile exists after the plant is closed. I will check the non-stockpile schedule in Utah to confirm if non-stockpile will be destroyed before demilitarization plant is shut down.

Q: Carl Ballinger, Pueblo County Department of Management: Has the treaty date changed?
A: D. Fisher: The official treaty date is still April 29, 2007.

Q: (audience) Which site is scheduled to end demilitarization operations first?
A: D. Fisher: Deseret is the first site scheduled to end demilitarization operations. The current end operations date is in 2004.

Q: Lori Thomas, USDA: What causes the delays in the demilitarization schedule?
A: D. Fisher: There are a lot of reasons for the delays. First, the chemical demilitarization program is technically very complex. Technologies and destruction processes have to be proven safe and effective to the satisfaction of each State's environmental oversight agency. There are also a lot of social and political issues related to chemical weapons destruction process. The Army has had to manage the demilitarization program in the open, which has subjected the program to a lot of public scrutiny. Because of public concerns with incineration technology, Congress directed the Army to consider alternative technologies for some sites and this has contributed to the delays.

Q: (audience) Do you have a closure estimate in the schedule for every site?
A: D. Fisher: Yes, the Army has an official schedule and we will put it on the CSEPP Planners web site.

Q: Kari Sager, Tooele County Emergency Management: There is an official schedule, but we are hearing other schedule estimates that we believe may be closer to reality and that is causing the Army official schedule to lose credibility with the public. Is the Army going to provide a revised schedule?
A: D. Fisher: The Army is in a difficult position with the treaty date and the schedule issue will be addressed in the next Defense Acquisition Executive review.

Q: (audience) How is Russia doing with their chemical demilitarization program?
A: D. Fisher: The Russians' chemical demilitarization program is considerably behind the U.S. chemical demilitarization program.

Q: Lori Thomas, USDA: Does the Army have an independent contractor monitoring the air quality around the chemical demilitarization plant?
A: D. Fisher: Not sure that there is an independent contractor monitoring the air. Believe that the chemical demilitarization prime contractor is responsible for air monitoring.

3.7 Planning Integration

This summary combines the presentations and discussion from the two planning integration breakout sessions during the conference. The session moderators were Joe Herring of FEMA HQ and Dennis Legel of SBCCOM.

Dennis Legel of SBCCOM introduced the first Planning Integration Breakout Session. The session included a group of presentations on shelter-in-place and on recovery and restoration. Marianne Rutishauser of Tooele County Emergency Management, who serves as Chairperson of the Shelter-in-Place Work Group and Subcommittee, gave her own presentation and introduced presentations by George Yantosik of Argonne National Laboratory, Dan Maloney of Argonne National Laboratory, and Tom Warnock of FEMA HQ. Steve Douglas of the Pueblo County Department of Emergency Management, who serves as Coordinator of the Reentry/Recovery Work Group, gave a presentation and introduced presentations by Clark Combs of the Kentucky Division of Emergency Management, Michael Myirski of SBCCOM, Ron Graham of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and David Holm of the Colorado Office of Emergency Management. Questions for all presenters were deferred until the end of the session and are included at the end of this summary.

Presentation #1: Evacuate or Shelter-in-Place: The Protective Action Decision Process (Marianne Rutishauser, Tooele County Emergency Management)

Under CSEPP Policy Paper No. 1, the program's goal is to minimize fatalities in case of an accident. Protective action decisions (PADs) must be rapid to be effective. It is the committee's recommendation that off-post officials complete their initial public warning cycle within 8 minutes from receiving the PAR from the on-post officials. To achieve this goal requires a complex cooperative planning process that includes modeling in addition to decision trees and/or checklists. Hazard analysts and planners should have modeling credentials. While evacuation is ordinarily the preferred protective action, sheltering in place will be necessary if evacuation cannot be accomplished before a hazardous plume arrives. An interactive public education program is key to public acceptance of SIP as an effective PAD. Nevertheless, some people will not comply with a PAD for individual reasons. Therefore, all protective action strategies and future CSEPP exercises should consider evacuees and people sheltering-in-place, and accommodate the entire PAD process from the initial notification through a recommendation to terminate SIP, even if evacuation is the PAD.

Presentation #2: Terminating Shelter-in-Place (George Yantosik and Dan Maloney, Argonne National Laboratory)

The most important variables involved in deciding when to end SIP are source term values, meteorology, shelter air change rates, distance of shelters from the source, and the dose-response relationship employed. The timing of sheltering actions taken by the affected population will also influence the optimum time to end SIP, i.e., consideration must be given to toxic effects that occur before, during, and after the population is sheltered. Poor timing of sheltering actions can result in greater toxic effects than remaining outdoors with no protection. Recommendations on how to end SIP will depend on several variables. Ventilation of the shelter is important if the shelter is within the hazard wedge and the occupants are going to remain inside because they cannot exit. If they are going to exit or relocate, ventilation is not that important, and might result in additional harmful exposure in the process.

The key to when to end SIP is to determine what factors produce the smallest area where toxic effects will be above the allowable threshold. A computer model can analyze these factors

and display areas where toxic effects will be above this threshold at different times following a chemical weapons agent release. This display allows identification of the time when the contaminated area is smallest, thereby indicating when to terminate SIP PADs. Argonne developed such a model, called TSIP.

Public education must explain the vapor infiltration concern; yet convince the potentially affected population that SIP is a viable action if this protection is ended at the appropriate time. Emergency instructions must be clear, concise, and consistent with public education materials, and vice versa. Instructions to the public while in shelters should be repeated at frequent intervals and should include the time that is optimal for ending SIP, the preferred way to end SIP for each sub-zone, and alternatives if the preferred option is not possible.

Army and off-post authorities should formally agree on what information concerning SIP will be exchanged among organizations during an emergency to ensure that this action will be timed and implemented effectively. The Army and each off-post jurisdiction should expand their CSEPP and CAIRA plans to cover the essential elements of a successful temporary SIP effort. It would be beneficial to practice SIP termination decision-making and the dissemination of public instructions and emergency information during CSEPP exercises. The scenario design and extent-of-play agreements in CSEPP exercises should be expanded accordingly.

Presentation #3: Actions Following Shelter-in-Place Termination (Thomas Warnock, FEMA HQ)

Once a SIP PAD has ended, emergency management issues remain. Each person who has been sheltered in place should be offered medical screening and decontamination. Medical treatment priorities should be set so that those with symptoms are treated first, then those who have been sheltered in the plume area, and finally those who have evacuated. If resources permit, this prioritization can be facilitated by selecting different evacuation routes for those who have sheltered than for those who evacuated immediately. The needs of those with companion animals also must be considered. Special needs populations who shelter, but who cannot evacuate after shelter terminates, should be instructed through EAS messages and other mechanisms to ventilate their shelters following exit. Those who are sheltered in special facilities should be instructed similarly. All populations that have taken protective actions should be tracked to facilitate smoother re-entry, better treatment of any long-term health effects, re-unification, and legal claims.

Presentation #4: Overview of Reentry/Recovery Work Group Activities (Steve Douglas, Pueblo County, CO Emergency Management Director)

The Reentry/Recovery Work Group addressed the issues of definitions, who is in charge of reentry/recovery, when is it safe to go home, agriculture, and legal claims. The 1994 draft *CSEPP Re-Entry/Restoration Plan Workbook* that the group discovered proved to be an invaluable resource and should be reviewed, updated, and finalized. For example, the draft workbook's definitions of reentry, recovery, and restoration remain largely valid. A great deal of credit is due to Randy Hecht of FEMA Region IV and to Ted Medley of the Colorado Office of

Emergency Management, both of whom worked very hard on answering the question of who's in charge, but who could not attend the conference.

Presentation #5: Who's in Charge? (Clark Combs, Kentucky Division of Emergency Management)

As detailed in a variety of CSEPP-related federal plans and regulations, each jurisdiction has an "in-charge" role, depending on geography, that can be managed using the Incident Command System (ICS). The ICS provides a consistent organizational structure and emergency management functional breakout that all jurisdictions can use. It is a proven system for emergency response and can accommodate the military's unified command (UC) system. Each major response component B local, state, federal, and responsible party B has both important responsibilities and constraints on their ability to act. Among the most important prerequisites for this system to succeed are for training and familiarity with the ICS/UC system to be addressed in plans. Tabletop exercises are essential to allowing responders to work out their own solutions to the command issues that inevitably arise. A number of valuable resources are available to assist in learning more about the ICS.

Presentation #6: When is it Safe to Go Home? (Michael Myirski, SBCCOM)

The analogous question to "when is it safe to go home" is "how clean is clean." The conclusions of this group are very similar to those reached by the Off-Post Monitoring Integrated Product Team. Monitoring can be very helpful, but cannot determine where a hazardous plume has been. Both monitoring and modeling are needed and should be used jointly following an accident. For example, a statistical model could be used to develop a sampling grid with the appropriate density; both unbiased and biased (e.g., near schools, which require special consideration) sampling would be needed to obtain the data. Local planners should identify available resources, such as Real-Time Analysis Platforms (RTAPs) and mobile laboratories. Taking account of the time element is also essential for effective re-entry/recovery plans because obtaining laboratory analyses of samples may take weeks and will impact on when areas can be declared clean.

Presentation #7: Agricultural Issues (Ron Graham, U.S. Department of Agriculture)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) services are available without charge on request to assist states in planning, training, exercise participation, and exercise evaluation with respect to agricultural issues. If an accident occurs, states must request USDA assistance in order to obtain it. County and state boards will arrive on the scene first, followed by USDA HQ some 10-12 hours later. If FEMA establishes a disaster field office, USDA will help staff it, assisting under the Federal Response Plan in both firefighting- and food-related support functions.

USDA's role is not regulatory unless contamination might cross state lines. The agency can help state and local governments in developing embargo and quarantine procedures. The goals of the agriculture subgroup were to review Appendix M of the CSEPP Planning Guidance, to identify items for the planning web site, to identify critical planning elements, and to identify helpful resources. Other areas where USDA can assist are in providing land use maps, integrating fish, game, and forestry into post-accident sampling plans, providing guidance on developing

food sampling plans, recognizing the role of public confidence, and developing related training materials.

Presentation #8: Legal Claims (David Holm, Colorado Office of Emergency Management)

The legal tools available for making claims following a chemical weapons agent accident are imperfectly suited for the job of obtaining compensation. Installation commanders have only limited resources to respond to an immediate threat. The Stafford Act can provide funds quickly and triggers other federal benefits, but requires a Presidential disaster declaration, a 25% non-federal cost-share, and is not really designed to make whole those who have been harmed by such an incident. The Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) is designed to compensate for federal torts and allows for some consequential damages, but is narrowly construed by courts. Under the FTCA only one claim can be filed for each incident, the victim bears the burden of proof, and the system is inherently adversarial. The Military Claims Act (MCA) is better suited than the FTCA for rapid action, but is limited to damages from military activities, is narrowly construed, and is adversarial also. Federal environmental legislation can provide benefits for temporary relocation, but is primarily aimed at supporting local governments and not the general public. Some public officials have discretionary funds that can be used very broadly, but the amounts are usually quite limited; it is probably necessary to get the media involved to obtain such benefits. In the end, the best legal claim tool is probably to obtain Congressional legislation or extraordinary executive action following an accident because these can be designed as broadly as the need. However, this can be subject to political whims and concerns and probably will require media involvement.

First Session Q & A

Q: Jacques Mitrani, Argonne National Laboratory: What happened to the concept of "return" to areas thought to be contaminated that were not contaminated, e.g., where only a corner of zone falls under the hazard wedge as modeled, but where the plan calls for the entire zone to be evacuated?
A: Steve Douglas: This term is not presently in use. Monitoring and sampling should be used to determine when it is safe to return to an area that has been evacuated, even if the D2PC modeling suggests that only a portion of the area evacuated was affected.

Q: Henry Hoffman, AMC Surety Field Activity: Why should those who have been sheltered be decontaminated?
A: Thomas Warnock: CSEPP guidance states that evacuees should be offered medical screening and decontamination.

Comment: Henry Hoffman, AMC Surety Field Activity: We need to educate the public about this. We should not encourage people to be screened if contamination was not possible because, for example, the release was of liquid agent that could not have traveled far enough to cause contamination. The guidance needs to avoid over-encouragement of treatment.

Comment: John Gray, SBCCOM: There is a huge misunderstanding of what exposure can be expected. There will be nothing to decontaminate.

Comment: Marianne Rutishauser. I suggest that you include these comments in response to the SIP Workgroup Survey the work group is taking. It can be found at the CSEPP Planners' Web Site, whose URL is http://www.csepp-planners.net/index.asp.

Comment: John Gray, SBCCOM: After all these years, we have total ignorance of the meaning of decontamination. People cannot be decontaminated following exposure to chemical weapons agent in vapor form because the vapor creates no *residual* contamination hazard.

Comment: Henry Hoffman, AMC Surety Field Activity: We should not encourage decontamination if people cannot be contaminated by liquid agent.

Comment: Thomas Warnock: The current guidance leads us there.

Comment: Clark Combs: It's only guidance.

Comment: George Yantosik: It is influencing behavior negatively.

Comment: Thomas Warnock: Regardless of whether the policy comes from a regulation or from guidance, if you offer decontamination, you are stuck offering it to a certain extent. If the policy is not correct, then it needs to be changed.

Comment: Dennis Legel: Did the City of Baltimore offer decontamination following the hazardous materials train derailment last week in the Baltimore Tunnel?

Q: Ron Graham: What is mechanism for those in the agricultural community to get compensation for their losses?
A: David Holm: There are two routes. If deposition occurred as determined by modeling or monitoring, then this would be a pretty direct effect and it should be easy to get compensated under the FTCA or MCA. Consequential damages, e.g., damage to the reputation of agricultural products from the affected area, would be harder to collect because it could affect an entire county. For that situation, Congressional action is probably necessary. The absence of direct impact would make it very hard to recover compensation for this type of damage.

Q: Jacques Mitrani, Argonne National Laboratory: Without an evacuation time estimate, is the decision of whether and how long to shelter-in-place hard to determine? Does each community have a good evacuation time estimate?
A: Michael Myirski: Evacuation time estimates were prepared, but they are now are dated.

Comment: Marianne Rutishauser: Are you recommending updating them?

Comment: Steve Douglas: This program is like a combination of a fish bowl and a pressure cooker, particularly for local elected officials who find themselves tasked with making decisions about allowing evacuees to return to normal activities in areas that have been evacuated due to a chemical accident. Please take these questions (Who is in charge? ... When is it safe to go back home?. . . How clean is clean?. . . etc.) home and make the issues clear at the local level, perhaps through tabletop exercises.

Second Session Q & A

Comment: Bill Smith, Maryland Emergency Management Agency: The National Contingency Plan states that DoD is the Federal On-Scene Coordinator, and therefore is in charge at a chemical weapons agent release.

Comment: The Reentry/Recovery Work Group answered that DoD would be the Federal On-Scene Coordinator and would not take local decision-makers out of their responsibilities to make decisions. It was recommended that all CSEPP planners take the Fire ICS course or course IS195 at the Emergency Management Institute or on the FEMA website.

Comment: Robert Stanley, Indiana State Emergency Management Agency: Contrary to the ICS and UCS, authority should remain with the locals.

Comment: Marianne Rutishauser: The Reentry/Recovery Work Group should take up the issue of whether people will be extracted following an accident. Also, the Work Group should make a recommendation to the national exercise IPT to give support to a reentry and recovery table-top exercise the day after scheduled CSEPP community exercises.

3.8 Budget and Cooperative Agreement

This session was conducted in two parts, covering two breakout session time slots. Dan Civis opened the session and talked about the ongoing budget processes over the past year, his concerns about the process, and how we need to work to make corrections.

Presentation #1: CSEPP Budget Process (John Zadra, ANL)

Mr. Zadra gave an overview of how the Department of Defense budget process works, including:

- The Acquisition Program Baseline process; how it works and why it is important to the Acquisition Program budget process. He talked about the upcoming CSEPP Defense Acquisition Executive Review later this year.

- The DoD Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System. He gave an overview of the process, likening it to three overlapping rolling doughnuts, with overlapping year considerations. He emphasized the 2.5 year lead time to get things into the budget.

- Congressional Defense Appropriations Process. Mr. Zadra summarized this process and how the DoD Budget request interfaces and is worked.

- FEMA Cooperative Agreement Process. Mr. Zadra summarized this process, potential disconnects with the previously discussed DoD processes, and how we try to reconcile the two.

Mr. Zadra concluded his presentation by discussing the current status of this process with respect to the CSEPP budget.

Presentation #2: Overview of the FEMA Cooperative Agreement Process (Ms. Lisa Craven Darlington, FEMA HQ)

Ms. Darlington gave a brief overview of how the FEMA CA process works, what is required, what states must submit, and that the next submission is due September 10, 2001. She talked about the trend to move towards an automated system and the advantages of using automation.

Presentation #3: Automation of the Cooperative Agreement Process (Mr. Charlie McNulty, FEMA HQ and Mr. Gary Hilbert, IEM Inc.)

Mr. McNulty discussed the status of the effort to automate the CA process, beginning with Mr. Salter's request to automate the process and continuing to the current status. He talked about documentation that has already been produced to tell the requesters how the process works. He emphasized to the audience that if you need training in this process and use of the automation to please ask for it. The automation process will reduce the time to submit CA requests from a couple of weeks to a couple of days. The Automated CA process uses off-the-shelf Microsoft products that the states and counties are already using, so it is not anything new or difficult to learn. Eventually, there will be a cash reconciliation capability for users to see what they are spending and what remains. Mr. McNulty gave an overview of how the software will work and what documents/forms will have to be generated. He also talked about some things to watch out for if you are audited using this automated process. Simplicity and clarity are the goals of this effort.

Mr. McNulty had Mr. Gary Hillbert of IEM give a demonstration of the software. There are two applications, the CSEPP CA Narrative Reports Generator, and the CSEPP Financial Forms Generator. Financial Forms Generator, a MS Access/Excel Application Program, was demonstrated first.

Q & A

Q: Jim Ishmael, Kentucky: Is this process also going to apply to Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Funds?
A: It should apply.

Q: Anna Ray, Utah: Does the new system require us to enter old expenditures and all line items, or just the bottom line?
A: Don't know answer. You will have to work that out with your FEMA region. It seems you would want to rack line items.

Q: Jack Dubose, Deputy Director, Arkansas: Right now we are using paper and written forms. Is this process going to change. Are EMPG and other programs going to switch to automation?
A: We're trying to move everything to simplified automated systems.

Presentation #4 : Administrative Cycle of Grants and Cooperative Agreements (Mr. Charlie McNulty, FEMA HQ and Mr. Gary Hilbert, IEM Inc.)

Mr. McNulty summarized what happened during the first session. Then he provided an overview of the administrative cycle of grants and cooperative agreements. He emphasized the importance of the pending close outs with cash reconciliations, property, and the reports (Quarterly Narrative Report, Quarterly Financial Report, and Application Narrative Report). All reports, including guidance and documentation, have been color coded to make it easier for those involved with the accounting to relate to the guidance and documentation. CD-ROMs are planned for succeeding years.

The CSEPP CA Financial Forms Generator was explained with its menu of automated forms and automated movement of data between forms and reports. In the Generator, there are two categories of selects. One can select from either the six workbook and form options or the two FEMA internal use forms. Links are planned to Smart Link next year. Grants and articles can be added, if needed. The interlinks are important enhancements this year, carry-overs are shown. Status is shown. Cash management forms allow reconciliation as the year progresses. Work books are included for the Form 20-10 and for budget deviations. Contractual arrangements are included in the reports too.

IEM discussed the application section with the Form 20-16 for assurances and certifications. Yellow blocks mean you can enter information according to what a county/state has to submit. The SF 424 is linked to the 20-20, so that form has to be developed first. Everything is developed by fiscal year and each fiscal year is separate. You can make a 424 by state or locality. The state option is a rollup that takes all the lower level budgets and rolls them up. Often, tops of forms are different, so data cannot be reused between forms.

There are two forms for FEMA internal use - FEMA Form 40-1 (Requisition and Commitment for Services and Supplies) and FEMA Form 76-10A (Obligating Document Award/Amendment). A data demonstration was conducted for the Excel spread sheet for Forms 20-191 and 20-10.

Comments were requested at an Emmitsburg workshop in December and none were received, so there is an assumption of approval. The forms are placed in a step down format. Note that there will be training in November at Emmitsburg.

Q & A

Mr. McNulty summarized the questions from the previous session about outlays and recording data. The whole accounting issue is seeking an understanding between program managers and accounting managers. Gary Hilbert demonstrated the local citizens advisory commission budget form.

Q: Larry Keene, FEMA Region X: in loading the new software on our computers, do you need to delete the old CA database?
A: Version 4.0 was issued last year with 2001 guidance and meant to be put overtop of the old database, databases will then be reorganized by benchmark.. The new version is set to be put on top of 4.0.

Q: David Guilder, FEMA Region IV: can you have as many performance indicators and expected outcomes as you want?
A: In FY 2001, people were to check out the performance outcomes, but no numbers were to be calculated, the x's and y's did not have to completed. Further question, if the expected outcome is 90% in 10 minutes and they can only get 85% in 10 minutes where do they enter this? Answer: Put in the comment box for the item number, an internal feature, cannot be printed out.

Q: Larry Keene, FEMA Region X: what of using the weights, can you adjust the weight if you want to show that a goal is not being reached?
A: Prefer using the "Result" box in the CSEPP Quarterly Work Plan Report to show the fact that one has not gotten to the target.

4 CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

The closing plenary session was held on the afternoon of Thursday, July 26 in the hotel grand ballroom. It featured presentation summarizing the various breakout sessions during the conference, and closing remarks from program executives.

Presentation #1: Report from Exercise and Training Breakout Sessions (John Gray, SBCCOM, Ron Barker and Robert Norville, FEMA)

The most significant exercise issue concerns the compression of the exercise schedule and its impact on resources. FEMA and SBCCOM will continue to work the scheduling issue and will get a letter to Mr. Salter and Mr. Fisher, outlining options for resolving the schedule compression issue. In addition, a letter requesting a decision on movement to the Integrated Preparedness Evaluation methodology and finalizing revision of the blue book will be directed to FEMA and Army program management for approval and dissemination.

Training issues identified included impact of the exercise scheduling issue on Medical and Public Affairs training, making the training/exercise/planning matrix job specific (tying it to specific jobs within CSEPP) and adding performance measures to the matrix, providing more training in JIC technology (due to the current limited number of training slots), and addressing requests for more CSEPP evaluator training.

Presentation #2: Report from Planning Integration Breakout Sessions (Joe Herring, FEMA and Dennis Legel, SBCCOM)

The Coordinated Plans Work Group recommended that local CSEPP communities use the CSEPP Local Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) to self-assess their plans. The Planning Website Work Group recommended that the planners website be placed in maintenance mode, that areas be created for materials on training, exercise and public affairs, and that the medical portion of the website be developed in the coming weeks. Members of the Reentry and Recovery Work Group recommended updating and finalization of the 1994 draft CSEPP Recovery Plan Workbook, encouraged integration of the Incident Command System in CSEPP training, planning and exercise activities, development of better definitions of modeling, monitoring and sampling as they pertain to recovery, encouraged coordination with U. S. Department of Agriculture on agricultural resource contamination and incorporation of claims issues in future exercises. The Work Group will continue to work the issue of extraction of shelterees, coordinating their efforts with the Shelter-In-Place Work Group.

The Shelter-In-Place Work Group made numerous recommendations during their breakout sessions. Recommendations included:

- $ Incorporation of protective action decision information exchange criteria into a memorandum of agreement between on-post and off-post officials;
- $ Clarification and formalization of the “8 minute rule” for off-post notification;

- $ Definition of and differentiation between informal “heads-up” notification and “official” CAI notification;
- $ Credentialing of hazard analysts and planners;
- $ Accident site monitoring to support source term values used for modeling;
- $ Further development of the TSIP model and integration into decision support tools;
- $ Development and expansion of public education programs, instructions, agreements, plans, and exercises to support a Shelter-in-Place termination strategy;
- $ Consideration of separate screening and decontamination sites for SIP populations;
- $ Consideration of relocation, screening and decontamination of animals;
- $ Terminate shelter options for those who cannot relocate themselves; and
- $ Tracking of populations taking protective actions.

The Shelter-in-Place Work Group also identified the following milestones: (1) Post conference materials and the SIP survey form on the Planners website by July 31, 2001; (2) Post final SIP survey results by August 31, 2001; (3) submit final draft SIP guidance to CSEPP planning community by October 15, 2001 and (4) present final SIP document to senior program management for approval by December 31, 2001.

The 2001 CSEPP Planning Conference will be held December 4-6, at the Perdido Beach Resort in Alabama, and is open to all CSEPP planners and program managers. The planning conference will feature breakout sessions and case studies. Additional state and local participation is needed.

Presentation #3: Report from Public Awareness Breakout Sessions (John Yaquiant, SBCCOM)

Very few issues were raised during the breakout sessions. The most significant issue identified is the lack of funding for the Ready, Set, Act campaign. Pending a decision on funding, the Work Group will continue to implement “Ready, Set, Act!” at each site. Working with the CSEPP sites, the Working Group will develop a survey methodology to assess public awareness, develop and refine campaign products, and share best practices. The group will work to stretch budget dollars to attain the CSEPP Public Affairs IPT Vision. They will continue to work as One Team, with One Voice while addressing One Agenda.

Presentation #4: Report Medical Breakout Sessions (Lisa Hammond, FEMA)

The subjects covered during the Medical breakout sessions were determined by combined input from a medical users survey and the Medical Planning Group. During the three breakout sessions five subjects were addressed and four presenters from medical or disaster response organizations outside of CSEPP spoke. The presentation on the Georgia hazardous materials incident highlighted actual incidents that showed the impact such events can have on medical facilities and personnel, while stressing the need for planning, equipment and training. The casualty planning presentation outlined the tasks of the medical examiners/coroners office and emphasized the need for addressing the coroner’s role and responsibilities in disaster response plans. The care of psychogenic patients session focused on recent exercises and actual incidents that pointed out the need to include mental health professionals in response planning while

examining the psychological and behavioral consequences of chemical or other disaster events. The presentation on New JCAHO standards for hospitals provided an overview of the new standards and how they were implemented in two CSEPP states. Finally, the panel discussion on integrating CSEPP plans explored how to overcome hurdles to developing integrated plans that address any disaster situation. The six Medical Quality Improvement Teams will continue to work on solutions to issues needed to improve medical response capabilities.

Presentation #5: Citizens Advisory Commissions (Ned Covington, OASA-ALT)

Two Public Laws provide the statutory basis for the Citizen Advisory Commissions (CACs). P.L. 102-484, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY1993, directed the establishment of a CAC at each stockpile site. Each commission is comprised of nine persons appointed by the Governor of the State hosting the stockpile site. Seven member are from the local area, within a 50-mile radius of the site, while two members are from state government. An Army representative from OASA-ALT meets with each commission twice annually. Commission members are not reimbursed for their service on the commission and each CAC is terminated upon the destruction of the site's stockpile. P.L. 104-106, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY1996, established requirements for quarterly (later became an annual requirement) financial reporting by the CACs to Congress.

Presentation #6: FY 2002 Budget (Denzel Fisher, OASA(ESOH))

Mr. Fisher provided a brief overview of the budget constraints expected for FY2002. He indicated that the total CSEPP request for each year of FY02-07 exceeds the 1997 CSEPP Life-Cycle Cost Estimate amount. FEMA, SBCCOM and Mr. Fisher's office are working to resolve budget shortfalls. They will do everything they can to ensure that there is no diminishment in response capability. Some very hard work will be required to meet program requirements.

Closing Remarks (Russell Salter, FEMA)

Mr. Salter presented a service recognition award to Mr. Tom Johnson, OR Health Division. Mr. Salter expressed his thanks to the conference participants for making the conference a success. He expressed his belief that CSEPP continues to be successful because it is truly a team effort and he asked that the dialogue that had taken place during the conference continue throughout the coming year. In addition, he recognized the efforts of the Conference Planning Committee in contributing to the success of the conference. He announced that next year's conference will be held in Lexington, Kentucky, on June 24-26, 2002. Finally, Mr. Salter asked session attendees complete and turn in the conference assessment forms placed on their chairs.

- Definition of and differentiation between informal “heads-up” notification and “official” CAI notification;
- Credentialing of hazard analysts and planners;
- Accident site monitoring to support source term values used for modeling;
- Further development of the TSIP model and integration into decision support tools;
- Development and expansion of public education programs, instructions, agreements, plans, and exercises to support a Shelter-in-Place termination strategy;
- Consideration of separate screening and decontamination sites for SIP populations;
- Consideration of relocation, screening and decontamination of animals;
- Terminate shelter options for those who cannot relocate themselves; and
- Tracking of populations taking protective actions.

The Shelter-in-Place Work Group also identified the following milestones: (1) Post conference materials and the SIP survey form on the Planners website by July 31, 2001; (2) Post final SIP survey results by August 31, 2001; (3) submit final draft SIP guidance to CSEPP planning community by October 15, 2001 and (4) present final SIP document to senior program management for approval by December 31, 2001.

The 2001 CSEPP Planning Conference will be held December 4-6, at the Perdido Beach Resort in Alabama, and is open to all CSEPP planners and program managers. The planning conference will feature breakout sessions and case studies. Additional state and local participation is needed.

Presentation #3: Report from Public Awareness Breakout Sessions (John Yaquiant, SBCCOM)

Very few issues were raised during the breakout sessions. The most significant issue identified is the lack of funding for the Ready, Set, Act campaign. Pending a decision on funding, the Work Group will continue to implement “Ready, Set, Act!” at each site. Working with the CSEPP sites, the Working Group will develop a survey methodology to assess public awareness, develop and refine campaign products, and share best practices. The group will work to stretch budget dollars to attain the CSEPP Public Affairs IPT Vision. They will continue to work as One Team, with One Voice while addressing One Agenda.

Presentation #4: Report Medical Breakout Sessions (Lisa Hammond, FEMA)

The subjects covered during the Medical breakout sessions were determined by combined input from a medical users survey and the Medical Planning Group. During the three breakout sessions five subjects were addressed and four presenters from medical or disaster response organizations outside of CSEPP spoke. The presentation on the Georgia hazardous materials incident highlighted actual incidents that showed the impact such events can have on medical facilities and personnel, while stressing the need for planning, equipment and training. The casualty planning presentation outlined the tasks of the medical examiners/coroners office and emphasized the need for addressing the coroner’s role and responsibilities in disaster response plans. The care of psychogenic patients session focused on recent exercises and actual incidents

that pointed out the need to include mental health professionals in response planning while examining the psychological and behavioral consequences of chemical or other disaster events. The presentation on New JCAHO standards for hospitals provided an overview of the new standards and how they were implemented in two CSEPP states. Finally, the panel discussion on integrating CSEPP plans explored how to overcome hurdles to developing integrated plans that address any disaster situation. The six Medical Quality Improvement Teams will continue to work on solutions to issues needed to improve medical response capabilities.

Presentation #5: Citizens Advisory Commissions (Ned Covington, OASA-ALT)

Two Public Laws provide the statutory basis for the Citizen Advisory Commissions (CACs). P.L. 102-484, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY1993, directed the establishment of a CAC at each stockpile site. Each commission is comprised of nine persons appointed by the Governor of the State hosting the stockpile site. Seven member are from the local area, within a 50-mile radius of the site, while two members are from state government. An Army representative from OASA-ALT meets with each commission twice annually. Commission members are not reimbursed for their service on the commission and each CAC is terminated upon the destruction of the site's stockpile. P.L. 104-106, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY1996, established requirements for quarterly (later became an annual requirement) financial reporting by the CACs to Congress.

Presentation #6: FY 2002 Budget (Denzel Fisher, OASA(ESOH))

Mr. Fisher provided a brief overview of the budget constraints expected for FY2002. He indicated that the total CSEPP request for each year of FY02-07 exceeds the 1997 CSEPP Life-Cycle Cost Estimate amount. FEMA, SBCCOM and Mr. Fisher's office are working to resolve budget shortfalls. They will do everything they can to ensure that there is no diminishment in response capability. Some very hard work will be required to meet program requirements.

Closing Remarks (Russell Salter, FEMA)

Mr. Salter presented a service recognition award to Mr. Tom Johnson, OR Health Division. Mr. Salter expressed his thanks to the conference participants for making the conference a success. He expressed his belief that CSEPP continues to be successful because it is truly a team effort and he asked that the dialogue that had taken place during the conference continue throughout the coming year. In addition, he recognized the efforts of the Conference Planning Committee in contributing to the success of the conference. He announced that next year's conference will be held in Lexington, Kentucky, on June 24-26, 2002. Finally, Mr. Salter asked session attendees complete and turn in the conference assessment forms placed on their chairs.